DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 474 591 HE 035 729

AUTHOR	Schar, Anne Marie
TITLE	Development of a Program To Support Faculty in the Creation of Online Courses at Saddleback College.
PUB DATE	2002-08-00
NOTE	187p.; Doctoral dissertation, Nova Southeastern University.
PUB TYPE	Dissertations/Theses - Doctoral Dissertations (041) -- Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Faculty; Community Colleges; *Curriculum Development; Higher Education; *Online Courses; *Program Development; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS	*Saddleback College CA

ABSTRACT

This study developed a program to support the faculty of Saddleback College, South Orange County, California, in the development of online courses. Information for program development was gathered through a literature review, a survey of 24 community colleges in California, and interviews with representatives of model programs. The appropriate components, content, and format for the program to support faculty were explored though input from a formative committee of faculty members and the developed program was validated through input from the formative committee and a summative committee. The developed program includes workshops, online tutorials, and mentoring. The hands-on approach of the program, online evaluation, and online discussion should enhance learning. The program includes content that focuses on navigating the technical aspects and learning the communications features of the Blackboard (tm) program used in the online courses. The program also contains tips on revising curricula to be presented effectively in the online format, addressing learning styles in the online environment, and understanding legal issues related to teaching an online course. The endorsements of the formative and summative panels and the thoroughness of the information gathering suggest that the program and the plans to implement and evaluate it are appropriate and valid. Eight appendixes contain additional information and some supporting materials. (Contains 5 tables and 76 references.) (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

HE HETR
2110

ED 474 591

DEVELOPMENT OF A PROGRAM TO SUPPORT FACULTY IN THE CREATION OF ONLINE COURSES AT SADDLEBACK COLLEGE

Anne Marie Schar

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS
BEEN GRANTED BY

A. M Schar

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

An applied dissertation presented to Programs for Higher Education
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Education

Nova Southeastern University

August, 2002

HE035729,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract of an applied dissertation presented to Nova Southeastern
University in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Education

DEVELOPMENT OF A PROGRAM TO SUPPORT FACULTY IN THE CREATION OF ONLINE COURSES AT SADDLEBACK COLLEGE

by

Anne Marie Schar

August, 2002

When the administration of Saddleback College decided to implement online courses they recognized that many faculty need assistance in making the transition to online formats for courses. The procedures implemented in this study produced a program to support the faculty in development of online courses. The primary methodology utilized in this study was development and the procedures implemented addressed the four research questions posed for this study to produce the program and plans to implement and evaluate the program. Initially the literature review, a survey of colleges, and interviews of representatives of model programs produced information about effective approaches employed to support faculty in the development of online courses and teaching strategies. The second question, concerning the appropriate components, content, and format for the program to support faculty in developing online courses, was addressed by applying the development methodology. The procedures for the remaining questions produced the plans to implement and evaluate the program.

The criteria and program as well as the plans for implementation and evaluation were based on information gathered from the literature, survey, and model programs. The criteria and

products were developed and validated with the assistance of the advisory formative and summative panels. The program includes workshops, online tutorials, and mentoring approaches. The hands-on approach of the program, online evaluation and online discussion thread forum should enhance learning. The program includes content that focuses on navigating the technical aspects and learning the communications features of the Blackboard™ program, revising current curricula to be effectively presented in an online format, addressing learning styles in an online environment, and understanding legal issues in regard to teaching an online course.

Based on the thoroughness of the information gathering and the endorsements of the formative and summative panels it was concluded that the program and the plans to implement and evaluate the program are appropriate and valid. It was recommended that the program be implemented and information about the program be disseminated on campus. Recommendations for further research included efforts to identify areas where faculty experience difficulties and to seek information about effective approaches at other institutions. The research and evaluation information should be utilized as the basis for modifications to meet changing faculty needs and changes in technology.

Acknowledgments

This study is the result of guidance and assistance from many individuals that contributed to my success and deserve to be mentioned. There are individuals that deserve to be mentioned by name.

Having Dr. Kenneth Varcoe as my major advisor has contributed greatly to this learning experience. His guidance and knowledge were essential to the completion of this task. I am grateful for his encouragement and sincere interest in my successful completion of this goal. It has been an unforgettable learning experience. Dr. Donald Busché has provided me with unstinting encouragement. He has generously guided me through the completion of my Nova experience. He assisted me in many ways, including graciously allowing me to work with his institution to complete my study. He has my heartfelt gratitude. Dr. Martin Parks has provided me with the time needed to complete my study. He also graciously joined my committee and provided excellent feedback and support through the conclusion of the process.

My study would not have been as rich if not for the assistance of my formative and summative committees. Both of my committees supported me by giving their own time to review documents and provide feedback. Their contributions have greatly enriched my study. I thank them.

A final word of thanks goes to my husband, Brian Schar. He is the man who provided me with the financial and temporal means to finish this program. I am also grateful that he ignored the late nights, lost dinners, numerous leftovers, and general crankiness that went along with the creation of this study. Thanks Geek-Boy for mopping my tears, cleaning the house, and fixing dinner.

The experience of writing my applied dissertation has greatly enhanced my professional and personal life. Thank you who have contributed to this process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES 9

Chapter

1. INTRODUCTION 10
  Nature of the Problem 11
  Purpose of the Project 12
  Background and Significance of the Problem 13
  Research Questions 16
  Definition of Terms 16
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE 18
  Overview 18
  Concerns of Distance Programs 18
  Legal Issues 21
  Teaching and Learning Styles and Technology 23
  Professional Development 24
  Model Programs 28
    Components 29
    Content 31
    Format 32
    Personnel 33
    Program Evaluation 33
  Summary 34
3. METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES 35

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES 9

Chapter

1. INTRODUCTION 10
    Nature of the Problem 11
    Purpose of the Project 12
    Background and Significance of the Problem 13
    Research Questions 16
    Definition of Terms 16
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE 18
    Overview 18
    Concerns of Distance Programs 18
    Legal Issues 21
    Teaching and Learning Styles and Technology 23
    Professional Development 24
    Model Programs 28
        Components 29
        Content 31
        Format 32
        Personnel 33
        Program Evaluation 33
    Summary 34
3. METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES 35

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont)

Page

Methodology 35

Procedures 35

Information Gathering 35

Development of Faculty Support Program 37

Development of Plan to Implement 39

Development of Plan to Evaluate 40

Submission of the Program and Plans 41

Assumptions 41

Limitations and Delimitations 41

4. RESULTS 43

Overview 43

Effective Approaches of Other Colleges 43

Literature Review 43

California Community College Programs 46

Appropriate Components, Content, and Format for the Program 68

Program Criteria 69

Saddleback College Blackboard™ and Online Course Program 70

Program Implementation 80

Criteria 80

Implementation 80

Program Evaluation 84

Criteria 84

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont)

Page

Evaluation 84

5. DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 87

Discussion 87

Data Gathering: Building Criteria 87

Criteria 89

Program Components, Content, and Format 92

Implementation 98

Evaluation 100

Conclusions 101

Effective Approaches 102

Appropriate Components, Content, and Format 103

Program Implementation 104

Program Evaluation 105

Implications 106

Recommendations 107

Recommended Actions 107

Program Dissemination 109

Further Research 110

BIBLIOGRAPHY 111

APPENDIXES 117

A. Formative Committee Members 118

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont)

Page

B. Summative Committee Members....119

C. Letter to California Community Colleges....120

D. Survey Instrument for California Community Colleges....121

E. Follow-Up Interview Instrument for California Community Colleges....123

F. The Criteria for the Research Study....129

G. Saddleback College Blackboard™ and Online Course Program....130

H. Letter to Dr. Donald Busché Submitting Program to Saddleback College....182

Biographical Sketch of Anne Marie Schar....185

LIST OF TABLES

Table

Page

1. Length of Time Institutions Have Used Blackboard 49
2. Internal Versus External Blackboard™ Training 50
3. Surveyed Institutions that have Professional Development to Aid in Creating/Modifying Online Courses..50
4. Professional Development Outcomes and Components..51
5. Method of Training Implementation...52

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Saddleback College is one of two accredited community colleges in the South Orange County Community College District. Saddleback College employs more than 200 full-time faculty members and numerous associate (part-time) faculty. The College services over 23,000 students. It offers diverse courses designed to meet the needs of the surrounding community. Saddleback College offers approximately 2,000 course sections each fall and spring semester and approximately 1,000 in the summer. There are more than 130 majors. Students may meet on-campus or at a designated off-campus site.

In 1997, Saddleback College opened its Innovation and Technology Center (ITC), with the goal to enhance instruction and job performance through faculty and staff development projects and to support technological innovation across the campus (ITC, 1998). By 1998 the ITC was offering over 65 workshops for beginners and advanced users. Workshops including instruction in the use of the World Wide Web and the Internet, Email and Newsgroups, Microsoft Office, and other application programs. All faculty, staff, and associate faculty may use the ITC. Registration can be completed through the Saddleback College web site or via telephone.

Nature of the Problem

Saddleback College has implemented online courses using Blackboard™ authorware as part of its programming. It has been decided that a faculty development program is needed to facilitate the development of online courses (D. Busché, personal communication, October 16, 1999). The faculty of Saddleback College is expected to use this authorware to create and teach online courses and coursework.

Currently, many of the faculty do not know how to use the authorware and most are not familiar with how to create distance education courses. The administration and Academic Senate are involved in discussions relating to this issue (D. Busché, personal communication, October, 16 1999). There is a need to help the faculty overcome resistance to the new delivery system and to create an interest in utilizing the authorware. The challenge for many will be to learn how to modify their teaching strategies and approaches to an online modality effective for online delivery. The Vice President for Instruction of Saddleback College has indicated that a program designed to assist faculty in making this transition will be important (D. Busché, personal communication, February, 13, 1999).

Purpose of the Project

The purpose of the project was to create a program to support the development of online courses. The program includes a series of workshops for faculty, materials for the workshops, online technical and pedagogical support mechanisms, and a mentoring system. In addition, the project includes plans to implement and evaluate the program.

To overcome possible resistance of faculty who may be reluctant to consider online courses, the program was designed to assist faculty in understanding how to organize course content using online formats. Chandhok (as cited in Gilbert & Geoghegan, 1995) observes that it "... isn't the computer software that makes it work, it's the combination of the innovative curriculum, the skills of the teachers, and lastly the technology" (p. 28). The merits of good online courses and approaches will be demonstrated and faculty will have a chance to see model courses and a variety of teaching techniques.

The program resulting from this study was designed to assist Saddleback College faculty with the process of modifying current course offerings to online format courses. Although learning how to utilize the Blackboard™ authorware is emphasized by the program, the focus is on how traditional classroom methods (e.g., lecture, discussion, and student presentation) can be modified for delivery in an online format. The workshops include important topics like legalities of online teaching, expanding the simple training of using the prescribed authorware program. Course assessment and the integrity of student assessment are also topics. Faculty and student concerns identified in the review of the literature are addressed by the program. For example, Harvey and Purnell (1995) describe a workshop that examines faculty professional development needs including dealing with the anxieties and organizational issues that hinder technology use, and how to generate realistic expectations about what can be accomplished with technology.

The materials created for the Saddleback program take faculty through the process of modifying information and knowledge used in-class into an effective online course. The objective of these materials is to provide a structure that faculty members of all disciplines can follow to create online courses by modifying existing classroom-based materials.

A plan for the implementation of the program was developed. Among the considerations in this plan are how and when to offer the various components of the program. Costs to implement the program were considered. The materials are available through an online format. The times of workshops, number of workshops, and who should teach the workshops has been determined based on model program reviews. Other components include mentoring, technical assistance, and online support. An important aspect of the program was to determine the personnel needs and how these persons are prepared to assume various roles in the implementation of the program. The literature clarified guidelines for implementation and covered not only the method of implementation, timelines, and content, but also addressed issues such as how to work with recalcitrant faculty and those who resist the move to online formats.

The evaluation plan for this program is multi-faceted. There are both formative and summative aspects to the plan. The assessment of the program will consider questions relating to the effectiveness of the workshops, materials, and support services. The assessment endeavors to identify online challenges for faculty that are not anticipated by the program as designed.

Background and Significance of the Problem

Online computer teaching is a recent innovation in education. Change is often slow in being adopted by teachers. West (1999) cites the example of the overhead projector, now a staple in educational institutions, that took over 30 years to reach mainstream usage. In 1999 only 10-20 percent of faculty used computers in conjunction with teaching.

Saddleback College has committed to providing online courses and coursework for students of the college. A panel has determined that Blackboard™ authorware will be used to implement the online services. Professional development is necessary to train the current faculty to use not only the Blackboard™ program but also to utilize the new online resource to create courses that are as effective as the current course offerings. Strategic planning is advocated with regard to implementing online courses. According to Frances, Pumeranz, and Caplan (1999, p. 32), "We should be planning and budgeting for academic excellence not technology.".

Professional development programs are an important part of planning and budgeting for academic success. It is essential to help the faculty accept the changes in technology and create interest in moving to the online programs. Since change is not always welcomed or considered beneficial (Ornstein & Hunkins, 1993), it is important that the transition into online courses be supported by a program that addresses such reluctance to change. Parker (1996) explains that colleges of education must look critically on how technology is integrated into teacher preparation programs. Parker reports that faculty are very interested in using technology as a productivity tool to improve instruction. Faculty are willing to increase use of technology provided that equipment, support personnel, and training are available. Parker concludes that it is necessary to aid faculty in modifying traditional teaching methods to produce online courses.

Gallant (2000) conveys the importance of strategic planning for incorporating technology into teaching. To manage the change four issues should be highlighted: changes in teaching style, rewards, ethical issues, and general strategic planning. She explains since the technology itself doesn't guarantee improved teaching or learning, discussions regarding alternative educational paradigms must take place. It is also important to remember that change in education and practices must come from the teachers themselves (Newman, 1998). Faculty often list a lack of support from administration and peers, a lack of incentives, and the need for additional personal time as reasons for resisting changes (West, 1999). These issues must be addressed to effectively bring about the desired educational change to implement online courses effectively.

The desired outcome of the implementation of this program includes providing assistance in implementing new technology and providing new services while maintaining high standards. In a discussion on professional development for faculty regarding the use of computers, Mingle, Oblinger, and Resmer (1995) state the importance of addressing changes *vis a vis* the current teaching/learning culture for a program to be successful. There is a concern that the quality of courses produced online will not meet the high standards set in traditional classrooms. Kearsley and Moore (as cited in Ely, 1996) have determined that the actual course delivery, traditional or distance, does not impact the quality of education as much as the quality of design.

Resmer et al. (1995) emphasize the significance of changing the teaching and learning culture at institutions to successfully implement increased use of information technology. Not only will faculty need more preparation time for courses but they will also need to change the nature of their class preparation. Moursund (1999) bemoans the inability of the traditional inservice to provide satisfactory training. The traditional inservice often does not allow for differences in learning styles, give adequate feedback, or provide follow-up for questions that arise at a later date (p. 1). He especially notes that the traditional inservice is not adequate for such significant changes as the use of technology as a teaching tool.

While computers are viewed as mechanisms of change, it is important to remember that the computers do not change the educational process but are a tool by which a teacher can teach. According to Privateer (1999), many believe that the computer can help the student learn; this is not true. He calls this thinking naïve because it is the use of the computer by a teacher that enhances the learning process. It is essential that the teacher participate in the learning process, the computer alone cannot do the work. Gallant notes that since teachers use their own learning experiences as a model for their own classroom shifting to the technology-based education can become a real challenge (2000, p. 5).

The question of using technology in the classroom arises when discussing the technological needs of faculty. In an online discussion with a group of educators, Rob Chandhok of Within Technology (as cited in Gilbert & Geoghegan, 1995) noted that in utilizing computer software in the classroom, students only use the features that the teachers show during recitation or lecture. With the instructor as the innovator in the classroom, the instructor must fully utilize the technology available, or the majority of students will not use the complete package.

There are many issues that arise regarding change to the online classroom format. Issues such as copyright and equality of access need to be explored by those moving into online coursework (Gallant, 2000). Gallant suggests that many issues can be resolved by focusing training on effective teaching.

The literature supports the need to create a strong supportive program for faculty at an institution that is implementing major changes. It is emphasized that professional development programs can help implement change more effectively and that they can benefit both the institution and the faculty. It is also emphasized that professional development programs must be planned and reviewed to be effective. They should be designed so that the faculty needs are being met, not just the needs of the administration. The faculty will need support and assistance to implement changes from the traditional course delivery to online courses at Saddleback College. A well designed program is essential to achieving this goal.

Research Questions

There are four research questions for this project. The first question is "What approaches have been effectively employed at other colleges to support faculty in the development of online courses and teaching strategies?" The second question is "What are the appropriate components, content, and format for the program to support faculty in developing online courses?" The third research question is "How should this program be implemented?" The fourth and final, research question is, "How can this program be evaluated to determine if the program is meeting the needs of the Saddleback College faculty?"

Definition of Terms

The following terms need clarification.

Asynchronous communication. Asynchronous communication refers to communication (e.g., electronic mail discussion) that happens in succession rather than at the same time.

Authorware. Authorware is software that enables users to create their own usable work on a computer; either online or within a program. For example, authorware may enable instructors to create tests on a computer for students' access via a web-site or in a computer lab.

Distance education. Distance education refers to education that takes place in an area outside of the traditional physical classroom. Distance education may include online courses as well as mail or telecourses.

Hardware. The hardware is the actual computer hard-drive, monitor, peripherals, and cords that will be used by people to access the Internet.

Online class. An online class is taught via computer using the Internet. The online class has no on-campus physical location.

Online course. An online course is the same as an online class. The two terms are used interchangeably.

Synchronous communication. Synchronous communication refers to forms of communication (e.g., a class, online discussion) in which two or more parties interact at the same time through a web-based mechanism. Regarding computer usage this denotes parties engaged in online communication at the same web site. They will see the conversation on their computer screens. This may also be referred to as, 'in real time' or 'in real life.'

Traditional class. A traditional class is taught in a physical classroom at a college, university, or other institution of education.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Overview

The review of the literature covers a variety of areas. It is important to examine not only program models through the literature, but also professional development, program design, and change management through concerns about distance education. Important issues in distance education are covered in articles focusing on concerns about program effectiveness and professional development and technical support of faculty. The literature also contains discussion about important legal issues pertaining to distance education.

Concerns of Distance Programs

Concerns about distance learning techniques, such as television, computer, or even mail methods, have been identified. The expression of concern is not limited to potential users or students; administration, faculty, and staff have also raised concerns. SchWeber, Kelley, and Orr (1998) relate a variety of challenges that their institution overcame to create their successful online program for the Graduate School of Management and Technology (GSMT) at University of Maryland University College. The administration first had concerns about the need for faculty with the interest and skills in teaching in an online environment while maintaining the integrity of their subject area competence. The second challenge for the GSMT was the delivery of academic support so that faculty would be trained to take advantage of the resources available and include them in the design and delivery of their web-based courses. A final administrative concern was the retaining and retraining of faculty for online instruction.

GSMT faculty also voiced concerns about online or web-based courses. The initial question raised concerns about the amount of time that it takes to teach an online course and the time spent in training and updating online faculty because of technological developments or last minute assignments (SchWeber et al., 1998, p. 347) It was established that online faculty spent 2½ to 3 times longer on course development. Eastmond and Granger (1998) also discuss the concern of extra time needed teaching online courses. They note that the extensive amount of time that online conferencing entails is a common complaint.

Time is an important issue noted in literature pertaining to distance education programs. The amount of time needed to prepare for online courses and to implement the communication processes and activities for online courses is greater than those for traditional courses. Conversely Ross and Schulz (1999) register saving time as an advantage to using the World Wide Web in the classroom. They state that "Once developed, online resources can save the professor time" (p. 7).

The online challenges are not only related to faculty abilities and time constraints but also to students. Robbins (1999) explains how in a distance education program at Darton College the concerns were quite similar for both faculty and students. Faculty who participated in the telecourses related feeling little personal connection to the course. Another notation from faculty was that the telecourses were not comparable to the on-campus courses in regard to activities or instruction.

Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg echoes the concern of detachment in regard to distance education at a speech made at the dedication of the Rutgers University Law School (as cited in Mauro, 1999). She is concerned about students learning without face-to-face interaction with other students or instructors. Although she acknowledges that students may engage in virtual interaction, she believes that ultimately this style of learning makes the internet a force for isolation rather than bringing people together. The lack of personal contact is discussed by Grasha and Yangarber-Hicks (2000). They note the importance of personal contact with teachers and peers as vital in student retention and in the ability for people to learn. They note that the challenge is for electronic-based teaching to capture the qualities of good instruction and to include personal contact in the electronic classroom. Evaluation of what is being done in the technology-based classroom can help identify difficulties (p. 1).

The University of Minnesota has a distance education system in place via television (ITV). The faculty and staff needs were assessed in part using a survey of practitioners (Kochery, 1997). Kochery's needs research shows that the greatest concerns were maximizing interactions and feedback and developing lectures.

Harmon and Strong (1997) raise issues of practicality when reviewing Web-based programs and coursework. Harmon and Strong's questions are adapted from McIlheran's (1997) *Consumer's Guide to College Courses on the Internet* and are formulated to help prospective students choose online programs. Online project developers should concern themselves with questions focused on the degree programs and the coursework involved.

Ely (1996) puts forward a different set of concerns. He expresses the need to discover the purpose of the distance education program and what is motivating it. He advances four questions about access to the new technology, the ability to use it, and the protection of rights of the faculty and staff. These questions directly relate to professional development for faculty. The answers of who will have access and will they know how to use it are both essential when designing a program.

Another issue echoed throughout the literature is the administrative and technological support needed by faculty as they are creating and using online courses. It is essential that faculty know that they will not be blamed for failures that were actually failures of the system support structure (Goldstein as cited in Harvey & Purnell, 1995, p. 3).

While concerns such as course integrity, personal interaction, and technology support are valid, they can be allayed by reviewing successful online programs, and creating supportive environments in which these programs can grow.

Legal Issues

Issues of copyright and intellectual property relate directly to distance program development. It is important that faculty understand copyright laws so as not to violate them. While institutions are subject to more flexible copyright use, it is vital that certain guidelines be adhered to by faculty. This issue, along with the question of intellectual property or who owns the online course and course materials, both need to be addressed. Gallant (2000) suggests that the issue of fair use and course ownership should be addressed early in the process so that faculty are cognizant of the information prior to using the new technology (p. 5)

Because of public debate and attention to issues regarding distance education, the U.S. Congress charged the Copyright Office with the responsibility of researching the issue and reporting the results of the study. *The Digital Millennium Copyright Act of 1998* (U.S. Copyright Office, 1999) reviews the copyright and fair use doctrines that have previously been discussed in relation to distance education by Kaplin and Lee (1995), and Colyer (1997). Provisions to specifically deal with online issues in distance education have been enacted by the Digital Millennium Copyright Act of 1998 (DMCA) Section 512 enacted as Title II. This act gives institutions legal security against being held liable for information transmitted simply for allowing student, faculty, and staff network access (U.S. Copyright Office, 1999, p. 100). An institution that meets statutory standards cannot be held liable for infringing transmissions. Assuming proper procedures were followed, the institution cannot be prosecuted in court for personnel violating copyright provisions. In acting as an access provider in distance education, an institution may limit liability under Section 512 of the Act. However, it is essential that certain conditions be met for this protection and these conditions are outlined in the report.

The point of the DMCA is to provide security through the guidelines in their new Chapter 12 to title 17 of the U.S. Code. This presents technological adjuncts to copyright protection to make digital networks safe for the exploitation and licensing of copyrighted works. This section of the Act is pertinent as it limits damages to educational institutions for damages in civil cases if the violation is innocent and there is no criminal liability (U.S. Copyright Office, 1999).

The legalities of distance education must be considered by the instructor and the institution when creating online services. Posting the legalities regarding basic fair use of copyrighted material and training staff and faculty via professional development courses is of great importance. While copyright was designed to protect the free flow of information in the public interest, it is still essential to safeguard the rights of producers and consumers of the information (Colyer, 1997, p. 57).

Another legal issue that should be addressed is meeting the requirements of the Americans' with Disabilities Act (ADA). Section 508 of the ADA requires that online courses meet accessibility requirements. Thatcher (2001) and Rubel (2002) explain that information including web sites must be accessible to those with disabilities under the ADA as well as those without disabilities.

It is important that legal issues such as copyright, course ownership, and the ADA be addressed. It is essential information for faculty and institutions. As it has been noted in the literature, more institutions and individuals are being held accountable for errors due to ignorance of the law. It is important that the information be made available.

Teaching and Learning Styles and Technology

Teaching and learning styles are a frequent topic in academic literature regarding the use of technology in the classroom and teaching online courses. Bruce Whitehead (2000) in a discussion on how technology impacts learning mentions that it has made a significant impression regarding learning styles. He says that Rita Dunn, a learning styles authority, has shown a significant correlation between the use of computer technology and enhancement of a student's visual, auditory, and kinesthetic learning styles.

Authors such as Ross and Schulz (1999), and Grasha and Yangarber-Hicks (2000) have focused research on integrating teaching styles and learning styles with instructional technology. Ross and Schultz note that technology has not only caused re-evaluation and restructuring on the part of institutions, but also that many college teachers are reevaluating the way that they teach and how students learn (p. 1)

Ebeling (2001) discusses how teachers can use a wide range of teaching styles to address the wide-range of learning styles in the classroom. He notes that probably no matter what approach is taken, some learners will not get the concept being taught. In addressing the question of what can be done about this he has developed a three step plan to alter teaching techniques to meet the needs of more learners. In order to help the learner to be more successful, the plan is to be more flexible in terms of variables such as time, complexity, input, output, support, goals, and participation.

The world wide web can be used by teachers to address all learning styles. Sensory, visual, auditory, and kinesthetic learning can be enhanced by integrating technology. Ross and Schulz (1999) review a number of types of learning styles and how the world wide web can accommodate different styles. They note that one great advantage of the Web is that it has the potential to meet students' individual learning needs. Other advantages cited include improving teaching excellence and increasing student motivation and willingness to learn.

Professional Development

The mission of professional development is broad. Professional development is designed to prepare as well as support educators to help students achieve high standards of learning and development (U. S. Department of Education, 1996). A development team for the Department of Education created a mission statement and developed principles to support and guide the efforts of professional development. The team determined that the purposes of professional development include developing further expertise in the use of technologies. Professional development focuses on not only individual improvement, but also results in organizational improvement. According to the team, professional development must be ". . . driven by a coherent long-term plan"

According to Ornstein and Hunkins (1993), people are resistant to change for a variety of reasons. One reason may be that it is easier not to change. Another source of resistance is the desire to maintain traditions. Change is also viewed as more work often without any new benefit or payoff. Another reason for resistance may be that people who go into teaching tend to be conformist and not innovative (Friendenberg as cited in Ornstein & Hunkins). Resistance to change may be rooted in the rapidity with which the change is occurring. Lack of knowledge will also create resistance to change. Finally, people will resist change if there is no financial support or time given to the change effort (p. 307). Because of the resistance to change on the part of many faculty members it is important that institutions be prepared to invest the necessary funds for hardware as well as the time for professional development to support them. The support, funding, and physical components of the program can help overcome the resistance of at least some faculty.

Thomas Harvey (as cited in Ornstein & Hunkins, 1993) lists twelve reasons why people resist change. The reasons range from personal to organizational. Ornstein and Hunkins acknowledge that Harvey's points of resistance make changes of any sort seem impossible. Yet, they rely on the ability of the change innovator to get beyond resistance. The key is to be mindful of the needs of those involved. Ornstein and Hunkins also propose steps to improve the attitudes toward change within an institution (p. 308).

Timing is important in making innovations smoothly. By making change to meet perceived needs within the community, the new program will most likely meet less resistance. More resistance will be met if the current programming is perceived as working well (Ornstein & Hunkins, 1993, p. 309). Resistance to change is elevated when the need is not apparent to those involved.

Harvey and Purnell (1995) describe a workshop that examined professional development needs. The discussion includes the importance of professional development in dealing with anxieties and organizational issues that can hinder technological change. It also includes discussion of realistic expectations of what can be accomplished with technology. Lack of time was perceived to be the greatest barrier to professional development. Harvey and Purnell state that the challenge in technological professional development is to find some way that teachers can see technology as an opportunity rather than a threat.

The need for technological professional development and how to implement new technologies is echoed in Schwandt (1996) who discusses how faculty vitality is significantly related to institutional vitality. Cifuentes, Davis, and Clark (1996) also state that technological professional development is necessary to transform teachers from "sages" to "guides" in the classroom. The Teachers Software Institute (TSI) was designed to provide software training for teachers so that they could serve as mentors in computer technology. Albaugh and Knight

(1997) explore the professional development model for this program. They believe that the value of this program is that it reinforces principles that are included in the professional development literature that includes feedback on the program (p. 10).

Resmer et al. (1995) note that training in computers is important for faculty. The strategy for networked computing devices focuses on getting computers to all students on campus. However, challenges include not only access for students but training for faculty and staff. The model encourages training for faculty and staff prior to student access, the faculty and staff being an integral part of the success of the student access model (p. 29). It is important for program success that changes include the current teaching/learning culture.

Teacher training is emphasized by many studies. A study presented by Louisiana Tech University intended to provide information that could be utilized to improve the integration of technology in teaching and learning at the college (p. 12). The results were intended to be used to provide insight into what improvements could be made at the college regarding use of technology in instruction as well as teacher preparation.

Teacher training is central if faculty are expected to use the multimedia made available to them. Hurn and Thibeault (1996) note the "generation gap" between faculty and students with regard to technological abilities. Miami University of Ohio uses technology fairs to reach faculty and encourage professional development. Miami University also has a summer institute program to target novice faculty. Faculty and staff use of multimedia has increased over 50% since 1994.

Professional training should contain a variety of components. Williams, Gold, and Russell (1994) also present a model teacher training program in which the focus is to meet the needs of rural teachers. Components of this program include skill training in planning and implementing professional development. This component includes evaluation of professional development programs. A basic survey of needs assessment is included in the article. The scale is weighted 1-5 with 1 being "very much" and 5 being "not at all." The scale is intended to help professionals rate their needs for training in skills. The survey is intended to help respond to teachers' training needs (Williams et al., 1994, p. 13). Gallant (2000) suggests that professional development be designed to include responsiveness to the individual needs of the participant, provide continuity in training to reinforce ideas, build community to provide support, and incorporate constructive activities based on real-world needs of the participants.

An important component to professional development is coaching. Bybee and Loucks-Horsley (2000) emphasize the role of coaching in relation to learning to use technology to teach. Coaching programs can help teachers achieve goals by focusing classroom observations on the desired goal (p. 4)

Karlen (1994) discusses the value of technology at educational institutions. The importance of adequately preparing the full-time and adjunct faculty to properly utilize the technology available is stressed. According Linda Belcher McElwrath, Director of Information Systems at Bakersfield College, the three keys to success are to have formalized training classes that are repeated each semester, commit support staff to respond to calls for assistance, and also provide a multimedia lab where faculty can work away from students (as cited in Karlen, p. 3). Karlen and McElwrath also emphasize that if an institution wants faculty to be computer literate, it must show faculty that computer knowledge is essential. Furthermore the institution must provide appropriate and convenient access to equipment and training. Karlen laments that this often is not the case.

Different learning styles can be incorporated into training. Kochery's (1997) design for using cooperative learning in the distance education environment focuses on the importance of cooperative learning as a way to create student success in distance education. However, Kochery also emphasizes that cooperative education may not be appropriate to all courses. When it is appropriate, he encourages structured strategies and training: "Collaborative instructional strategies require changes in the professor's attitudes and behaviors as well as changes in students' attitudes and behaviors" (p. 156)

Moursund (1999) summarizes the keys to effective professional development by comparing it to effective learning. Access to important information that can actually be used by the teacher is first. Regular feedback is the second key. Time and effort is the third component. The opportunity to apply knowledge and skills that have been learned is also important. Providing professional development is important to any institution. It is imperative that the institution heed the directives of the literature in view of the fears of change and faculty timidity of technology. Any professional development must be meticulously planned and implemented.

Model Programs

The literature review provided a variety of model programs designed to aid faculty in creating online courses through professional development programs. The programs included a variety of components implemented in a variety of ways. Some programs were designed to be taken within a semester, while others were implemented in summer programs. The personnel involved in the programs included technology-professional development staff and computer-experienced faculty (SchWeber et al., 1998). Compensation for involvement on the part of the program staff and the participants differs. Time implementation varies in the different programs as does the number of workshops and online tutorials.

Program components included workshops, trainer observation, and hands-on practice. Content for the programs included, but was not limited to, technology training, legal issues, and pedagogy. Programs were based on learning to use software applications (Albaugh & Knight, 1997; Smith, 2000) as well as curriculum-based programs (Bybee & Loucks-Horsley, 2000). A mentoring component was included in many of the programs to provide on-going support and feedback from experienced teachers (Albaugh & Knight, 1997). Online discussion and chats were also common components to such programs.

Components

Program components included a workshops, one-on-one interaction, and modules that faculty could work on at their own pace. Hands-on experience was common to programs. Video components, online chat, and online discussion threads were also components used by some programs. Bybee and Loucks-Horsley (2000) explain that workshops are being used by large-district elementary schools for reform initiatives. Teachers attend a series of workshops spaced through the school year where they experience units as learners. These workshops are curriculum based. Mastering the mechanics of teaching units is expected to take the first year. In-class assistance is available through demonstrations and coaching.

Workshops for professional development programs to support faculty in creating online courses are common to most programs. The hands-on experience with the computer in a lab setting is frequently utilized. The University of Maryland University College (UMUC) created a training program for the graduate School of Management & Technology (GSMT) faculty. The program provided workshops in a combination of mediums. The program had a total of 30 site-based and online-based workshops. The workshop topics included globalization, computer literacy, information literacy, and effective writing. Computer-mediated conferencing was used as well as a series of modules that had self-paced exercises (SchWeber et al., 1998).

Other programs did not have the extensive technological support that is provided for the UMUC programs. The University of Melbourne program included workshops in a traditional classroom setting because some workshop participants lacked adequate email access. The program design focused on an overview of current and emerging computer technologies and was geared towards alleviating technophobia. The program also included hands-on experience with hardware and software (Mason, 1996).

The Teachers' Software Institute (TSI) offered four three-day workshops for teacher training courses. The focus of the workshops was on software applications. During the workshops the participants would learn the software application and create a template or product for use in their classrooms (Albaugh & Knight, 1997). Software based workshops were also used to train graduate students who participated in a program to act as technology mentors for faculty (Smith, 2000).

Workshops are the predominant component in professional development programs. Another component used by programs includes self-paced modules for faculty to complete. Workshop materials are also available for review for a time period after the workshops (SchWeber et al., 1998).

Mentoring is often used in the programs providing support for faculty creating online courses. According to Smith (2000) mentoring benefits both the tutor and tutee through content, behavior, and social interaction (p. 2). UMUC has a large support network for faculty including faculty mentors. The third phase of the program includes the instructor in the classroom who receives feedback from a mentor/teacher who has had experience teaching online courses (SchWeber et al., 1998).

TSI encouraged teachers participating in their workshops to act as mentors to others within their buildings. Teacher mentor activities include teaching others how to use software and suggesting applications for the classroom. This was not an official mentoring component, but rather encouraged at an individual level.

Content

The content of professional development programs includes technical hardware and software information. Institutions include other components based on the focus of the professional development, the outcomes of programs, and the needs of those participating in the programs.

In an article discussing how teachers can learn to teach technology, Bybee and Loucks-Horsley (2000) discuss the curriculum-based workshops utilized by elementary school districts. The first year workshops allow the teacher to learn as a student and to take time to reflect on successes and problems within the units that they have already taught. Professional development continues by assisting teachers to assess what students have learned in lessons already taught and how teachers can assist students in conceptual development.

The workshop and program content often focused on technology. The TSI (Albaugh & Knight, 1997) and University of Melbourne (Mason, 1996) programs focused on teaching how to use technology and computer applications as well as classroom implementation techniques. The UMUC (SchWeber et al., 1998) program included a much broader content range for faculty.

The UMUC initial training included computer literacy and information literacy. Effective writing was also considered to be an important content aspect of the training. Fair use issues, enhancing student interactivity, online research, searching the web, and information and literacy across the curriculum were additional content areas of the training programs (SchWeber et al, 1998).

The TSI program focused on computer application, the use of software in the classroom, and the principals of visual and instructional design (Albaugh & Knight, 1997). Storyboarding is taught as a planning strategy. The evaluation of the program indicated that teachers had expressed a desire for other workshops on different topics (p. 5).

Format

At the College of Education and Human Development, Smith (2000) created a program that is mentor based. Graduate students are trained to act as mentors to faculty. Workshops are designed to teach the mentors PowerPoint through demonstration and a practice model. Through this method the mentors are instructed about using specific features of PowerPoint. The first session includes a leaning packet and question and answer session. At completion of the training mentors could operate the program. Faculty participating in the program then receive an introduction to the program. This is followed by six one-to-one sessions with the assigned mentor.

The format of the UMUC program is complex. This program consists of four phases taking place over two semesters. The workshops were offered during a one week period with materials being available for up to one month after the official end of the workshop. While pilot two-week workshops were implemented at the request of faculty participants it was noted that faculty "disappearing" after the initial week was an issue and the workshops were returned to the original one-week module.

Other than the roll-out of workshops, the UMUC phases consisted of faculty observing experienced online teachers, writing an observer's memo, working on a practice class followed by actual teaching while receiving feedback, and mentoring from an experienced teacher. The final phase of the program is the teaching itself while participating in online discussions (SchWeber et al., 1998).

The Teachers' Software Institute offers its teacher training courses in four three-day workshops. Each workshop features a different software application. Day one includes learning about the software and its proposed uses in the classroom. Day two includes developing a template and the principles of visual and instructional design. Teachers are taught storyboarding as a planning strategy. The final day the participants complete their templates and participate in self and peer evaluation of products. After the workshops teachers are expected to upload their templates using America On Line (Albaugh & Knight, 1997).

Personnel

The people involved in online teaching professional development programs include faculty and staff from a variety of institutional departments. The TSI workshops are conducted by TSI employees.

The University of Maryland University College uses a variety of faculty and staff to support their online professional development program (SchWeber et al., 1998). The program support personnel include the course managers who are faculty and administrators who actually designed the course syllabus that the program follows. The course manager provides materials and faculty guidance as well as fulfilling administrative duties and online visits. The Office of Library Services is also actively involved with supporting the program. Information and Literacy Across the Curriculum, Introduction to Online Research, and Searching the Web are the workshops offered by the Office of Library Services. Compensation for the personnel is through their current position. The institutions make use of current personnel and allow those with interest and experience to participate in the implementation of these programs.

Program Evaluation

The programs were all assessed in different manners. Smith (2000) includes interviews with participants prior to and subsequent to the training. The UMUC program was in part assessed by the retention of part-time faculty, citing this as proof of the success of their support efforts (SchWeber et al., 1998). The TSI workshops have been deemed successful based on the re-enrollment of teachers and representation of school districts in the program (Albaugh & Knight, 1997, p. 5).

Summary

The literature shows that while online courses are becoming more common there are legitimate concerns regarding the teaching of those programs. The model programs and basic professional development research show that with due care programs can be developed to address these issues and aid faculty in creating effective online courses.

Legal issues are discussed widely in the literature proving that there is concern regarding copyright, ADA, and course ownership. It is important that the information regarding these issues be made available to institutions and faculty so that laws are not violated through ignorance.

Model programs in the literature provide useful information regarding professional development programs and how to meet the challenges, create effective change, and produce effective programming. The components, formats, and staffing of programs contain similar items as well as widely divergent practices. The literature indicates that there is considerable variety in the programs and most programs have utilized existing staff and institutional resources. The model programs conduct formative evaluations and make changes to the programs based on feedback from the participants. This seems to indicate that the ability to work with the participants and change to meet the needs of the participants is essential to a successful program.

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

Methodology

The purpose of this study was to develop a program to support the creation of online courses at Saddleback College. The development problem solving methodology was the research method used for this study. Three products resulted from this study. The first is a plan for supporting the faculty in creating online studies. The second product was the plan for implementation. The final product was the plan for evaluation of the program.

The application of the development problem solving methodology includes reviewing the literature and developing the criteria for the products based on information gathered in the literature as well as information gathered through a survey and follow-up interview process. The development problem solving methodology also includes the process for review and validation of the criteria using a formative committee and summative committee.

After the development of the criteria, the product was developed; the product was developed based on the validated criteria. A formative review panel was consulted in the cycle of developing and modifying the product. The review and modification cycles assisted in the development of the program. A summative committee was assembled to validate the product. This development problem solving methodology was used to develop all three of the products.

Procedures

Information Gathering

To answer question one, "What approaches have been effectively employed to support faculty development of online courses and teaching strategies?" a review of the literature, surveys of other colleges, and interviews were conducted. The literature review focused on online courses and model programs that have been implemented. The literature was researched for essential program components, design, evaluation, and recommendations. The literature review sought to discover the legalities involved with online teaching and courses, technology and student assessment, technology and course assessment, professional development, and creating valid workshop materials. The review was conducted to seek information to form the basis for the criteria and each of the products (e.g., program, plan to implement, and plan to evaluate). The literature review was also used as the basis for the survey and the follow-up interview designed for gathering information from California community colleges that are currently using Blackboard™.

The formative committee consisted of three members of the Saddleback College faculty and staff (see Appendix A). Members were chosen based on recommendations from the Vice President for Instruction, Dr. D. Busché. A summative committee consisting of three members with expertise in online teaching was established (see Appendix B). One committee member acts as a resource person and trainer outside of her institution and another has won grants based on site design.

A letter of introduction and a survey instrument were designed using formative and summative committees to assist in the development and validate the survey instrument. The follow-up interview instrument was reviewed concurrent to the survey instrument in order to identify appropriate follow-up questions directly related to the survey instrument.

The survey and the follow-up interview went through the formative review process first. Reviews of both instruments were conducted by the formative committee for content and format. The feedback was reviewed and modifications were made to the instruments. The revised drafts were submitted for further review. No additional comments were made.

The summative committee reviewed the introductory letter, the survey instrument, and the follow-up interview instrument. The summative committee had several suggestions regarding the introductory letter. These suggestions were used to modify the letter (see Appendix C). The summative panel agreed that the modified letter and the instruments were appropriate (see Appendixes D and E).

The letter of introduction and survey instrument were sent to all California community colleges using Blackboard™ (N = 24). The data were analyzed by creating charts to track the survey answers. The charts were used to determine which colleges had faculty development programs and the type features the programs offered. Based on a review of the information gathered from the survey, community colleges with extensive professional development programs were invited to participate in follow-up interviews.

A telephone interview was set-up with each of the program coordinators from the community colleges that agreed to a follow-up interview. The validated follow-up interview instrument was used for the interview process. The responses were analyzed and commonalities and differences regarding programs were noted. Lists of programs' contents, formats, implementation, and evaluation procedures were created and compared.

Development of Faculty Support Program

The second research question is "What are the appropriate components, content, and format for the program to support faculty in developing online courses?" The analysis of the information from the review of the literature and the model programs formed the basis for the draft of the criteria as well as the content and format for the program to support faculty in developing online courses. In addition, the functions and characteristics of the Blackboard™ authorware program were considered as the program criteria and program content were developed.

Criteria

The formative panel reviewed the draft of the criteria. There were no suggestions for modification from the formative committee.

The draft of the criteria was submitted to the summative panel. The summative committee made suggestions regarding the draft of the criteria. The Comments and suggestions were used to modify the criteria. The revised draft was resubmitted to the summative committee. No further modifications were suggested and the criteria were considered appropriate and valid.

Program

The program was designed to be consistent with the established criteria based on information obtained from the review of the literature and model programs. A draft of the program design was submitted to the formative panel for comment and review. This draft included program components, content, and format for proposed delivery of the program.

The strategies for the delivery of the content included workshops, mentoring, and online resources. The content addresses the faculty needs identified by the literature. The program includes workshops, mentoring, evaluation, online tutorials, and online resources. The content includes Blackboard™ basic information, legal information pertinent to online teaching, and information regarding learning and teaching styles with specific reference to online teaching.

Modifications to the program were made based on feedback from the formative panel. The revised program was submitted for further review and no additional comments were made. The revised draft was submitted to the summative panel members and they were asked to compare the program to the established criteria. The summative panel indicated that the program was consistent with the established criteria and that the program was appropriate and valid.

Development of Plan to Implement

The third research question is "How should this program be implemented?" To determine how this program should be implemented, the criteria and the implementation plan were developed based on information derived from the review of the literature, model programs, and an analysis of the Blackboard™ authorware. Also, the implementation plan for the program criteria needed to consider the components, format, and content of the program.

Criteria

The draft of the criteria was submitted to the formative panel for review. The formative panel made no suggestions for changes for the criteria for the implementation plan. The draft of the criteria was submitted to the summative panel. The summative panel had no suggestions for changes to the criteria for the plan to implement the program.

Plan to Implement

The plan to implement the program was created to be consistent with the established criteria and based on information derived from the review of the literature and interviews. The program implementation design includes when the program is implemented as well as a designed format for implementation. The program is to be incorporated into the ITC professional development offerings. Implementation for the mentor program is also included in the plan.

The formative panel gave feedback on the draft of the implementation plan indicating that the plan met the needs of the school and fulfilled the criteria. There were no revisions to the implementation plan for the program. The draft was submitted to the summative panel. The summative panel reviewed the plan to implement and agreed that the plan met the established criteria and was considered valid.

Development of Plan to Evaluate

The fourth research question is "How can this program be evaluated to determine if the program is meeting the needs of the Saddleback College faculty?" Conducting an evaluation can determine whether the expected or planned outcomes have been achieved as intended. Ornstein and Hunkins (1993) note that when evaluation is applied to curriculum it can focus on whether the designed, developed, and implemented curriculum is creating the desired results (p. 324). This allows those creating curriculum to revise or maintain the current offerings.

Criteria

The process began with selecting criteria for the evaluation plan. The criteria for the evaluation plan were based on information derived from the review of the literature as well as what the program is designed to accomplish. The formative panel gave feedback on a draft of the criteria for the evaluation plan and had no suggested changes. The draft was submitted to the summative panel. There were no comments and suggestions from the panel regarding the criteria for the evaluation plan. The criteria for the program evaluation were considered valid.

Plan to Evaluate

The plan for evaluation of the program was designed to be consistent with the established criteria and based on information from the review of the literature. Multiple methods for gathering assessment information may be used to evaluate the program. Assessment tools were selected derived to address the criteria validated by the formative and summative panels. The formative panel gave feedback on the design of the program evaluation. Revisions were made based on feedback from the panel. The revised draft was resubmitted to the formative panel members and no further suggestions were submitted The summative committee was asked to review the plan and make comparisons to the validated criteria. The committee members agreed that the content was consistent with the criteria.

Submission of the Program and Plans

The faculty support program and plans for implementation and evaluation were submitted to Dr. D. Busché Vice President of Instruction, Saddleback College (see Appendix F). A transmittal letter with recommendations (see Appendix G) was also provided with the product.

Assumptions

It was assumed that the literature and the interview process provided information about effective strategies and approaches for professional development for faculty that could be used in the program for this research. That is, the information obtained could be used to form the basis for the design, components, implementation, and evaluation of the program for Saddleback College.

It was assumed that the formative and summative panel members have the knowledge to assist the researcher and validate the program criteria, the program plan, the plan to implement the program, and the plan to evaluate the program.

Limitations and Delimitations

The development of this program is limited in a number of ways. One limitation is that it pertains only to a program for Saddleback College. It may not be appropriate for use at other institutions. A further limitation of this program is that it only addresses the support of online courses at Saddleback College and not other modes of distance education.

The survey was sent to California community colleges believed to be using Blackboard™. Furthermore the information gathered was from 16 of 24 institutions that responded to the survey instrument. Another limitation was the number of institutions that participated in the follow-up interview (four).

The scope of this study was delimited in several ways. The focus was on developing a program to meet the needs of Saddleback College faculty. The program was developed to emphasize technology training with a focus on creating online courses using Blackboard™. Therefore the program does not include generalizations for faculty professional development components beyond the specific focus on training in regard to online computer-based distance education courses pertaining to the Blackboard™ author ware program. California community colleges were used because the same state regulations and restrictions govern Saddleback College.

Chapter 4

RESULTS

Overview

This study was designed to develop a program to support the creation of online courses at Saddleback College. The four research questions for this study prompted procedures relative to the identification of approaches employed to create support programs; appropriate components, content, and format for such a program; how this program could be implemented; and how this program could be evaluated. The program to support the creation of online courses at Saddleback College was developed by implementing the procedures to answer these questions.

Effective Approaches of Other Colleges

The initial procedures implemented were designed to address the first research question relating to effective approaches employed to support faculty development of online courses and teaching strategies. A thorough literature review was initiated to gather information about effective approaches. Community colleges that have programs were surveyed about their programs and interviews were conducted with directors of several model programs to seek the best practice based information.

Literature Review

A review of the literature was conducted with a focus on professional development programs designed to support teachers in learning to use technology to create online courses. The literature was analyzed to identify common features in program format, content, evaluation, and components.

The review of the literature provided some programs specifically for professional development regarding using technology as a teaching tool. The programs reviewed in the literature have certain common features. At the time the article was published these programs were described as ongoing. All of the programs included workshops for teachers to aid in using technology in the classroom and hands-on experience for faculty was provided. Some of the programs included other components such as online tutorials, mentoring, online discussion, and chat features.

Workshops

The workshops to aid faculty to use technology in teaching vary considerably in duration. Some programs are conducted for one to two weeks. Other programs are part of regular professional development programs at institutions. University of Maryland University College (UMUC) began its program as a one-week course, and then extended it to a two-week program to meet faculty requests. The two-week program was eventually discontinued because faculty tended to drop out of the longer program (SchWeber et al., 1998).

Although some of the workshops focus on the learning the computer technology applications (Albaugh & Knight, 1997; Smith, 2000) while others are curriculum based approaches that focus on teaching units (Bybee & Loucks-Horsley, 2000), workshop content often includes both. Programs such as the UMUC have well-developed extensive workshops which include applications, web research, information technology, as well as effective writing to aid the faculty (SchWeber et al., 1998). Other programs, such as the University of Melbourne, focus on alleviating technophobia amongst the faculty (Mason, 1996).

Mentoring

Mentoring is both a formal and informal part of faculty support programs. The Teacher's Software Institute (TSI) encourages program participants to return to their institutions and act as technology mentors for others. Mentoring activities might include suggesting software applications for the classroom or how to use specific software (Albaugh & Knight, 1997). Smith (2000) also supports the idea of mentoring. UMUC created a large formal mentoring program.

Faculty mentors provide feedback and support to instructors beginning to teach their online courses as part of the third phase of their program.

Content

The content of the programs center on both technology and pedagogy. Most of the programs include some sort of application of computer technology based instruction. TSI concentrates on teaching Microsoft applications such as PowerPoint (Albaugh & Knight, 1997; Smith, 2000). Included as part of these application workshops was how to use the application in the classroom.

Other programs highlight broader issues based in curriculum (Bybee & Loucks-Horsley, 2000; SchWeber et al., 1998). Curriculum-based programs focus on creating a useable product. Bybee and Loucks-Horsley discuss the importance of learning specific curricular units that can be applied by teachers in the classroom. The UMUC program (SchWeber et al.) is far more extensive including topics such as computer literacy, fair use, student interactivity, searching the web, and information and literacy across the curriculum.

Format

The format used for delivery of the programs was workshops and some online tutorials. The workshops took place in hands-on settings with computers. Programs included both single sessions and ongoing workshops.

Summary

The information about model programs in the literature provided a basis for creating a survey instrument and follow-up interviews. The questions for the California community colleges were based on the components of workshops, content, and the training focus identified in the literature.

The literature review provided little information about program duration, funding, and personnel. The UMUC (SchWeber et al., 1998) program and the graduate student mentoring faculty program (Smith, 2000) discussed the people involved in the program at length while other programs focused on the content of the program. Compensation for participants—learners, mentors, and workshop leaders—was not discussed in detail either.

California Community College Programs

Background

The next process in the development methodology was to review actual model programs at California community colleges. The review of programs focused on community colleges that were using the Blackboard™ program to deliver online courses. To gather the information from the community colleges a survey instrument was developed based on information gathered from the literature review. The survey instrument was sent to the community colleges using Blackboard™ along with a letter of introduction and instruction.

The letter of introduction, survey instrument, and follow-up interview drafts were submitted for review by the formative panel. The follow-up interview was reviewed concurrent with the survey instrument in order to identify appropriate follow-up questions directly related to the survey instrument. While there were many excellent suggestions from the committee, oftentimes they were not included as they were not pertinent to the study. The suggestions of the formative committee included a range of more specific questions that were more appropriate for the follow-up interview including the question of program evaluation and effectiveness and broad open-ended suggestions regarding such a program. It was also suggested that as an incentive to participate in the interview process, that the product be offered to all institutions that agreed to participate. This was deemed outside the scope of the study because the program was designed specifically for Saddleback College. Changes were made to the survey instrument and follow-up questions based-on suggestions from the formative panel. The drafts were submitted to the formative panel and no further suggestions were made.

The drafts were submitted to the summative panel. The panel suggested that the word brief not be used in the introductory letter unless the follow-up interview would be less than 15 minutes. It was suggested that it would give participants a false sense of time regarding the potential follow-up interview time. It was also suggested that the request for a copy of the gathered data be moved to the top of the survey instrument. The committee suggested that the survey instrument contain specific questions regarding faculty compensation. This was relegated to the follow-up interview for the purpose of keeping the survey instrument to one page as well as focusing on broader issues that could prompt detailed follow-up questions. The drafts were modified and resubmitted to the summative panel. There were no further modifications suggested and the letter (see Appendix C), the survey (see Appendix D) and the interview (see Appendix E) were considered appropriate and valid.

The survey was used to determine which California community colleges have professional development programs to provide support to faculty creating online courses. The surveys were mailed with return-addressed, stamped envelopes enclosed. California community colleges identified as having ongoing programs were invited to be interviewed.

The survey was a simple one page design sent to all California community colleges using the Blackboard™ program. The colleges were identified via the Blackboard™ web site as well as the California Community Colleges web site. The survey was used to determine how long the colleges had been using Blackboard™, how many of the departments and faculty of the institutions were creating online courses, whether professional development programs were available to support faculty, and what basic program components were being utilized.

After the surveys were returned five California community colleges with professional development programs were identified. These institutions were contacted and invited to participate in the follow-up interview. One institution chose not to participate in the follow-up interview. The interview protocol was designed to obtain more specific information regarding program components, funding, and faculty and staff participation in the professional development program.

Survey Results

The survey (see Appendix D) was a set of twelve items based on information deemed useful for the study and based on information from the literature review of online courses. Twenty-four California community colleges were sent the survey. The items were designed to determine which community colleges would be able to provide information as model programs in the data gathering process for this study. The surveys were mailed with an introductory memo directly to the person (if known) at the institution in-charge of online course development for the institution. Of the 24 surveys sent, 16 (66.7%) were returned.

The initial question asked if the institution has online courses available. The results showed that all of the Community Colleges surveyed do have online courses available (100.0%).

Secondly, subjects were asked to estimate the percentage of the departments at their institutions that offer online courses. This was an open item and subjects were asked to fill-in-the-blank. The answers varied from 1.0% to 100.0% of departments within the surveyed community colleges that do offer online courses. The average is 31.0% with a standard deviation of .28. Of interest were the colleges with the highest percentage of departments involved with online course offerings. The highest percentage was 100.0%, followed by 80.0%, 50.0%, 40.0%, 36.0%, with a small number of schools in the 20.0% range.

"Does your institution offer online degree/certificate programs?" was the third survey item. Of the 16, only 4 (25.0%) of the institutions currently offer degree or certificate programs. Two institutions indicated that they were currently working to put programs in place.

The fourth item asked the length of time that faculty at the institution have been using Blackboard™ (see Table 1). The choices of '1 year or less', '2 years', '3year+' were offered.

Table 1

Length of Time Institutions have been using Blackboard™

	Percent
1 Year or less	31.3
2 Years	31.3
3 Years+	18.8
Not using Blackboard™	18.8

Three (18.8%) institutions indicated that they were not currently using Blackboard™. Two institutions are currently using WebCT and the other institution did not state what program that it uses. Of the other 13 institutions, 5 (31.3%) have been using Blackboard™ for 1 year or less. Five (31.3%) institutions have been using Blackboard™ for 2 years. Three (18.8%) of the institutions have been using Blackboard™ for 3 years or more years.

The fifth item relating to the types of Blackboard™ training offered the following choices: Internal (institutional faculty or staff), External (trainers from Blackboard™ etc.), or Both. Table 2 shows that three (18.8%) institutions did not answer this question. Of the remaining thirteen institutions 8 (50.0%) used internal training and 5 (31.3%) used both internal and external training. None of the institutions used external training alone.

Table 2

Internal versus External Blackboard™ Training (N = 16)

Methods	Percent
Internal	50.0
External	0.0
Both	31.3
Did not answer	18.8

The sixth item asked "Did your institution create a formal professional development program to aid the faculty in creating/modifying courses designed to be online?" As seen in Table three, of the 16 institutions, 11 (68.8%) indicated that they have a formal professional development program for their faculty regarding the design of online courses. Two (12.5%) institutions indicated that they were in the process of creating such a program. The other 3 (18.8%) of the institutions indicated that they did not have a formal training program.

Table 3

Professional Development Programs to Assist with Online Courses (N = 16)

	Percent
Yes	68.8
No	18.8
In the process of developing	12.5

The seventh item was "What are/were the desired outcomes of your institution's professional development program?" The participants were asked to circle all choices that apply to their institutions. The desired outcome of more effective courses was selected by 14 (87.5%) of the respondents (see Table 4). Blackboard™ mastery was the desired outcome of the professional development program selected by 6 (37.5%). Other program outcomes were identified by 3 (18.8%) of the respondents. All six of the institutions that have Blackboard™ mastery as a desired outcome also included more effective courses as another desired outcome.

Table 4

Professional Development Outcomes and Components (N = 16)

	Percent
Desired outcomes of professional development programs	
More effective courses	87.5
Blackboard™ mastery	37.5
Other	18.8
Components of professional development training	
Mentoring	68.8
Workshops	93.8
Online tutorials	50.0
Evaluation	25.0
Did not respond	6.3

Institutions were requested to, circle all applicable components included in the professional development training from the listing of mentoring, workshops, online tutorial, and evaluation (see Table 4). One institution did not circle any of the components as applicable. The mentoring component is used by 11 (68.8%) of the 16 institutions. One respondent noted that mentoring is used only on an informal basis. Workshops were selected by 15 (93.8%) of the respondents while online tutorials had 8 (50.0%) responses. Only 4 (25.0%) indicated that evaluation was part of their professional development training.

The institutions were asked to estimate the percent of faculty that were involved in the training. The percentages for those with programs (N = 15) ranged from 1.0%-63.0%. Three institutions had 20.0%-30.0% involved while three institutions reported approximately 15%. The average percent of faculty involved in training from the survey results is 16.0%.

The next question asked respondents to identify how the training was implemented by circling all that apply from the following choices: individual, departmental, voluntary, and mandatory. Responses were made by 15 institutions with 13 (81.3%) selecting individual training and 3 (18.8%) indicating that departmental training was used (see Table 5).

Table 5

Method of Training Implementation (N = 16)

Type	Percent
Individual (N = 13)	81.3
Departmental (N = 3)	18.8
Voluntary (N = 15)	93.8
Mandatory (N= 1)	6.3
Did not answer (N = 1)	6.3

The three institutions with departmental training also had individual training. These three institutions also offer individual training and all training is voluntary. All 15 (93.8%) of the responding institutions stated that training was voluntary while one (6.3%) indicated mandatory training as well. The one institution with both voluntary and mandatory training indicated that some participants were volunteers and others were required to attend training by departments. Nine of the institutions with individual training have training on a voluntary basis. One institution marked that training is voluntary with no choices marked pertaining to individual or departmental training being used.

The respondents were asked about compensation for participation in training. Compensation is provided at 9 (56.3%) institutions but is not provided at 6 (37.5%) institutions (no response from one institution.) In response to the final survey item, 14 (87.5%) of the respondents indicated they would like to receive a copy of the survey summary.

Interview Results

The interview protocol (see Appendix E) included a series of questions designed to obtain more detailed information about current practice at institutions with fully developed program. The survey responses were analyzed and five colleges were selected for this process. These institutions were chosen based on the information that they were using Blackboard™ software for designing online courses, had professional development models in place for their faculty, and were willing to participate. Four of the five colleges invited agreed to participate in the interview process.

The interview items were designed to obtain information about the components the model programs were using as well as determine what the program initiators felt were helpful to the support process and what they would add or change about their programs. The interviews were conducted via telephone with the person at the institution in-charge of online course development for the institution. Each interview took approximately one hour.

The interviewees were assured of anonymity and all results are reported in aggregate form to maintain this anonymity. Interview participants were informed that some of the items would be reviews of survey items and others would be follow-up items to determine specific information about on-going professional development programs for faculty creating online courses. The interview protocol was customized for the institution being interviewed by excluding questions about components that were not addressed in the survey responses.

One institution, which had been listed as using Blackboard™ for online courses, had switched to WebCT. The interview was conducted regarding professional development since this institution does have a professional development program to support instructors in creating online courses and information about their program could provide valuable insights. All items concerning Blackboard™ usage were modified to pertain to WebCT usage for this participant. The items used for the interview refer only to professional development programs regarding online faculty course site development.

Institutional information. The first section reviewed institutional information and sought more specific knowledge about which departments were creating online courses or degrees. The participants were asked about their positions at the institutions as the professional development program facilitators. The participants were all part of non-academic departments that provided professional development to the faculty. Two of the participants' departments were specifically for technology support and training for the faculty.

The content items of this section pertained to the departments that offer courses online and the how and why the departments (or courses) were chosen. In addition, information was sought concerning online degree programs or certificates.

Of those interviewed only one institution had every department with at least one online course. The others had a wide variety including English, computer science, sciences, math, geography, and sociology. For the institutions with only specific departments with online courses, the response concerning how and why these were selected suggested instructor interest or desire for teaching an online course was the primary factor.

Two institutions offered online certificates or degrees. The certificates offered are International Business, Fire Technology, and Public Safety. The degrees offered are Computer Science and Office Information Systems. The other institutions indicated that they expected to offer complete certificate and degree programs online in the near future.

The participants were asked about any difficulties encountered using Blackboard™. The participants were asked about pedagogical, and/or other (i.e., faculty resistance) difficulties that might have arisen. While each participant noted that there had been few difficulties regarding hardware, one institution noted that the change from a UNIX to a Microsoft platform had created minor support difficulties.

Pedagogical difficulties were not mentioned but it was mentioned that faculty needed to be reminded that students will use text books while taking online quizzes or exams. Teachers were encouraged to design assessments to be used in conjunction with text books, use a variety of assessment methods, and utilize student collaboration approaches. One participant noted that his department had not worked to effectively assess the current online courses or instructors. During discussion generated by the interview questions, participants did note that some faculty had difficulty translating the objectives from the traditional classroom approach into online formats.

The other category provided information regarding resistance from faculty who already had online information or web sites. They did not want to move to the Blackboard™ format. There were also concerns regarding faculty as neophyte computer users who were uncomfortable giving presentations and instructions to students regarding how to access information and to use the course sites. Faculty resistance to setting up course sites was not a problem as all online course sites were voluntary.

Professional development. The second section of the interview contained items relating to the professional development support program for online faculty. This section contained general items regarding the components of the program followed by follow-up questions regarding component specifics.

The initial item of this section was a follow-up to the survey question regarding the approaches used for the professional development program. The participants were asked if they agreed with the survey approaches marked or if there had been any changes. Of the choices—workshops, online tutorials, and mentoring approaches—the only discrepancies were with mentoring approaches. Of those interviewed who had listed that there was mentoring available, only one institution had a mentoring program in place. The other institutions noted that mentoring was enacted as a one-on-one support from their department and that no peer mentoring was taking place.

All of the interview participants held workshops. Some of the programs included online tutorials.

The participants were asked about external professional training. While all responded positively to some faculty seeking outside classes to assist their online course creation, this was on an individual and limited basis. Only one participant reported utilizing faculty to train other faculty. The other participants reported that they did not utilize these faculty as trainers and one noted that they had tried to work with those faculty but, "it didn't work out."

The next item asked about the implementation of the professional development program. The possibilities included as one entire body, through departments, or by signing up through the institution. None of the answers given was mutually exclusive and the responses overlapped.

The majority of faculty participating in the professional development programs signed up as individuals although one participant noted that he was sometimes requested to give training to departmental groups. The faculty learned of the programs in a variety of ways including through the support department flyers, brochures, email announcements, and announcements of mandatory professional development programs. The faculty signed up via email, telephone, or by returning brochures of flyers. Most of the institutions offered the program as part of required flex day credits.

None of the institutions indicated that the professional development program was mandatory. As noted in the implementation response, the faculty sign up as individuals but one participant noted that at his institution the request to attend the program must be approved by the department chairperson. He also said that chairpersons or deans might also recruit faculty within a department to encourage them to take a particular workshop.

The next three items elicited information regarding the plans and status of the professional development programs. These questions included the other approaches in addition to those currently in use to recruit participants and modifications of current approaches utilized.

Some interview participants indicated that they would like to expand the accessibility to the workshops offered by creating more times and places for the program. Others indicated that they would like to make presentations to the faculty and publicize information during current workshops.

While participants agreed that the current approaches to recruitment were the best available, some indicated that they would like to discontinue the flex-day (mandatory professional development) workshops. This would allow the program to focus on faculty who are interested in teaching online courses and not those who merely want the credit. One institution noted that the workshops offered should be shorter than those currently being offered.

Each participant said that the online faculty course site support programs were on-going and expected to continue in the future. Some noted that they were looking to expand the program to meet greater faculty needs such as online assessment methods and learning styles.

The final question about program evaluation prompted a variety of responses. Each participant stated that instruments with multiple choice and open ended questions were given to the faculty to evaluate the programs. One institution includes an evaluation of the trainer by a dean. While this evaluation approach is utilized, individuals acknowledged that often the information obtained was not reviewed or used to modify the programs.

Mentor program. Only one institution interviewed had an organized mentor program available. Two of the institutions included only the support department one-on-one support as a form of mentoring. The fourth institution did not have any mentoring approaches. The mentoring questions were posed with all participants to elicit information regarding informal mentoring that may exist.

All participants were asked whether informal mentoring between faculty members was anticipated in designing the professional development or when observing training. Responses indicated that there was some informal mentoring, however, it was limited and inconsistent.

The two institutions with support department mentoring indicated that the mentors were chosen by being part of the professional development support department and compensation was part of their current institutional position. One of the institutions recommended that in the future there should be more formal mentoring.

One institution indicated that a single faculty mentor existed at the institution. The mentor had in interest in online course development and had taken outside courses and workshops. He volunteered to act as mentor and work with faculty during workshops. The interview participant was unaware if compensation was offered, however, she believed that he did receive time and expenses to attend conferences regarding online course development was paid by the institution.

Some of the other questions relating to mentoring were not applicable because a formal mentoring program was not evident at any of the institutions. However, the faculty mentor apparently tried formal meetings, but this caused difficulties for non-local faculty. It was also noted that these sessions often turned into "gripe" sessions. The formal sessions were disbanded. The mentor runs a discussion board where the faculty can post questions. He checks the board regularly and answers the questions. He also holds online chat sessions on a regular basis for faculty.

Also, the mentoring activities considered to be most beneficial to the mentee included conveying to the faculty that help was available. That is, "knowing he exists" and that they are "not alone" is the most beneficial aspect of the program for the faculty. Having a "physical touch point" is also important for the faculty. A further benefit was that the mentor's answers went beyond the basic online information, he was an excellent teaching resource .

The benefit of the mentoring to the mentor is having an opportunity to have an impact on new online teachers. He also believed that there was weight attached to "being involved in development."

The institution is satisfied with the mentoring and would conduct other mentoring programs in this manner. The aspect that the institution found most beneficial was the retention of online faculty. Another benefit was that the mentor was an older, established member of the faculty who did not get involved in issues regarding online course development such as course ownership or salaries. The attempt to form a cohesive unit of instructors was considered to be the aspect that was least beneficial as bringing them together as a group is difficult.

The one aspect that the interview participant would change regarding the mentoring program is that he would have involved the mentor much earlier in the training process. The early use of mentoring would have proved helpful.

In response to the question about recommendations for future mentoring programs, it was stated that mentoring works best with a good match. If the mentor and mentee do not match, mentoring should be sought elsewhere—don't try to make it work.

Workshops. All interview participants indicated that workshops to aid the faculty at their institutions with developing online courses were available. The interview items elicited information regarding who taught the workshops, how often workshops were taught, and how workshop teachers and attendees were compensated for their time. Items also included some review questions from earlier in the interview such as how faculty signed-up for workshops.

All of the current workshops were taught by internal faculty or staff. With the exception of the program utilizing the faculty mentor, workshops were led by faculty and staff whose specific job was to provide professional development and assistance to the faculty (some of these people hold staff positions others have faculty titles). Since these responsibilities are part of their current positions, no additional compensation was provided.

All of the participants indicated that outside contractors were utilized to support the professional development of the online courses. Blackboard™ and WebCT consultants did workshops. Some of the workshops were organized through districts and others on an institutional basis. Other companies utilized included Microsoft, Company of Experts, and Starlight Education. Interview participants noted that overall the experiences were not positive and that the external consultants did not fulfill the needs of the faculty.

Program cost and compensation for workshop participants is an issue in professional development programs. The participants stated that professional development workshop programs at their institutions were funded through the yearly budget. No special funding was necessary as the programs were developed through the department creating professional development. It was noted that because this money came from the professional development budget, the negative impact would be on monies such as might be traditionally be available for travel to conferences. Salaries for workshop and program leaders were a basic part of the budget already in existence and required no additions. The early forays into external consultants were funded partially since the contract to purchase software programs including training. The cost of other outside consultants came from the departmental budget.

Faculty participation in the online course development programs was compensated in a variety of ways. Most institutions offered the workshops as part of the mandatory professional development days (FLEX-days). Some institutions allow faculty to take the workshops as mandatory professional development or to receive other financial or time compensation. One institution offered financial incentives.

The flex credit at some institutions is not only mandatory but also adds the incentive of building time for extra time off. Time was used as an optional incentive at one institution through providing release time for developing an online course. Faculty choosing to take release time were expected to attend workshops and to create a viable online course for the next semester. This was part of the faculty contract.

One institution paid the faculty $35.00 per hour to attend training during summer sessions. The faculty signed a commitment to teach an online course for the fall semester. They were paid up to $1000.00 (cap) at $35.00 per hour for online course development training. The workshops allowed faculty to develop a formal course outline during the workshops.

Faculty signed up for workshops in a variety of ways including email, brochures, and flyers. Interview participants were asked to describe the workshop registration procedures. All of the institutions had faculty sign-up for individual workshops on a first-come-first-served basis. Some institutions require that department chairs sign the registration sheet. Some schools would have registrants sign-up immediately prior to the workshops through email announcements and flyers. Others sign-up at the beginning of the semester. No institution requires that all of the workshops be taken or that they be taken in a specific order.

The number of workshops offered varied as did the content of the workshops. Some institutions offer one introduction to Blackboard™ workshop while others had up to 13 workshops. The key topics included basic introduction to Blackboard™, using communication tools, online assessment, and pedagogy for online teaching. Institutions taught workshops that incorporated both the technology of the Blackboard™ program as well as the pedagogy of online teaching. The overall approach focused on the 'vision for course outcomes' as the basis for course design. One institution had faculty work step-by-step through building an online course. Overall, participants agreed that the communications portion of the Blackboard™ program was the most challenging for faculty and important to teach in workshops.

The participants were asked about the existence of other concepts for online class instruction (i.e., legal issues of copyright, cheating, evaluation online). Some interview participants said that these were incorporated into their program and not taught as a separate workshop. Others indicated that workshops focused on cheating, institutional provisions, and the question of who owns the online courses. One institution included some technical training as well, reminding faculty that some students had slower modems and computers and encouraging faculty to practice with home computers to relate to download and upload times. The fourth institution taught nothing other than using the Blackboard™ program in its workshops. The interview participant noted that they were currently developing other information regarding such information as legal issues and learning styles to be included in their workshops.

The materials utilized by the institutions for workshops and training are a combination of Blackboard™ (or WebCT) and institutional design. The Blackboard™ *Instructor Manual* was made available. Workshop materials included Blackboard™ courses designed for the faculty to be students and experience Blackboard™ from that perspective. These workshops used a variety of approaches to give the faculty ideas and experiences to use in their own online courses. Hands-on activities were created for online orientation. The Blackboard™ manuals are accessed and the online tutorials provided by Blackboard™ are used.

The number of times each workshop was given as well as the duration of workshop times varied from institution to institution. Some institutions offered workshops weekly and others only two times per semester. One institution offered the summer workshop as a week long program. The duration of the workshops was from one to four hours. The less frequent a workshop was offered the greater the duration.

All of the institutional workshops are hands-on and take place on campus in designated computer labs. Workshop participants are not divided into computer competency levels. Interview participants commented that competency levels would be helpful, however, their departments do not have the authority to require faculty with minimal skills to attend introductory computer courses or to take separate workshops. While some institutions do offer non-computer literate faculty separate computer courses, they could not require faculty to take them. Some institutions felt that this was not an important issue and others had extra support staff in the workshops to work with neophyte computer users. A further comment was that overall lack of computer skills and experience were not a hindrance, however, lack of typing skills could be detrimental.

Online training. Several of the institutions offer online tutorials, but online tutorials for Blackboard™ specifically or online course teaching are not available. The online tutorials offered were for applications, graphics, and computer skills such as internet searching. One institution used proprietary materials. Faculty used the tutorials on an individual basis via web access. Another institution created videos and made them accessible to the faculty on an individual basis using streaming video. The URL where the video shorts were located and a password were given out at the first faculty workshop.

Effectiveness of programs and training. Interview participants indicated that the characteristic that contributed to the effectiveness of the programs included accessibility, emphasis on hands-on skill development, and a focus on meeting the needs of the faculty. One participant noted that giving the skills for faculty to easily and successfully get online met the needs of a much broader group. Another institution said that the most effective part was in the steady development process (beginning to end of course development approach) and student perspective that made the program successful. The time given to practice in the workshops was listed as a part of the success of programs. One institution said that focusing on the Blackboard™ fundamentals was the most effective part for teachers and administrators.

When asked what was the least effective part of the training, a range of answers were provided. One respondent said that there was not enough emphasis on pedagogy, changing teachers' classroom methods, and modes of course delivery. Frustrations with issues such as a need for more support staff to help during training workshops or the inability to require faculty to participate fully and/or do prep work for the workshops were identified. Providing shorter workshops more frequently rather than longer workshops was offered as a suggestion.

Interview participants indicated that changes should be made to the current professional development programs for assisting faculty in creating online courses. One respondent stated that an extra beginning class at the end of each semester would be useful. This would be for faculty who had been working all semester to create courses, but were still having difficulty.

More support staff and more publicity would also be added. Another respondent would like to require that interested faculty begin as a group together and be required to work together through all of the offered workshops to create more of a group dynamic and create support within the group. This process would be a change from the current open entry and exit from the series of workshops offered.

Interview participants were asked if they had any general comments or suggestions to offer regarding professional development for faculty creating online courses. Ideas for change were reviewed as were the most and least effective parts of the training. One interview participant noted that his institution was ready to include more pedagogy as well as the technical Blackboard™ courses and indicated that these enhancements were important to the success of online courses.

Interview Summary

The interview participants noted that the professional development programs were created as needed. There was no strategic planning and components were added to the training as necessary. The programs were changed to meet changing needs perceived by the institutions' administrations rather than formative program design.

Workshops. All of the California community colleges interviewed had workshops for their faculty to aid in creating online courses. The workshops were offered through professional development training available at the colleges. All of the colleges said that a certain amount of professional development is required of their faculty and many choose to attend the Blackboard™ training to fulfill this obligation. While the workshops are offered at other times, the focus for most of the offerings is the flex-day schedules. Workshops supporting faculty to create online courses were added to the existing schedules of professional development workshops. Programs were not set up as outside training or in a separate department.

The workshops being incorporated into the current professional development program and schedule require no outside funding. The workshops are created and maintained by staff with responsibilities to conduct professional development sessions. Therefore, no outside funding is required to pay consultants. Two institutions did use outside training firms, but found this training to be limited in usefulness and discontinued the training.

The faculty attending workshops were there on a voluntary basis. Since faculty involvement is strictly voluntary in creating online courses, only those faculty interested take the available workshops. One noted drawback to the voluntary participation is that the workshop leaders have limited authority to have participants pay attention, take workshop offerings in sequence, or comply with follow-up projects. There was also a concern that some of the faculty attending these workshops were there to comply with flex-day requirements and were actually not interested in the workshop content.

The workshop leaders could not require specific computer skills prior to taking the workshops. Overall this was not considered a major impediment to the workshops. The leaders recommended that participants develop basic computer and typing skills prior to working with online courses. Typing was mentioned as the most important skill. While basic computer training was not a requirement for taking the workshops, it was strongly recommended. Basic skills and applications workshops were also offered through these professional development departments.

The most complex of the programs did offer a summer seminar. This program differed from the others as the faculty were directly compensated for attending workshops. The faculty had to commit to teaching one course online for the semester following the training. The compensation included $35.00 per hour of training up to $1000.00. Again, it was contractual that an online course would be taught by the faculty member the following semester.

Content. The content of the workshops focused on Blackboard™ and WebCT. The use of the program and how to input information was an important part of the training offered by all of the institutions. Some of the programs aided the faculty in creating a course site step-by-step using the program. Other programs offered workshops focusing on specific program aspects; an introduction to the program was followed by workshops to use features including using communications tools and adding documents.

Workshops to focus on broader issues were not common. Cheating, institutional provisions, legal copyright, and other broader concepts were more often taught as part of the Blackboard™ workshops than separately.

Technical computer training in hardware was only mentioned by one institution. The focus was to help the faculty understand hardware issues that might arise for students who study from their homes. Understanding modem speed and download processes were part of the training for faculty. Faculty were encouraged to work from home on computers so that they could experience some of the difficulties that a student might have in downloading a large document or attempting to link to a busy URL.

Currently, these institutions are all reviewing their programs to support faculty in creating online courses. The programs are deemed to be successful; however, additions to content are being considered. Workshops focusing on varieties of assessment, learning styles, and how to use the computer technology to its potential are being considered.

Mentoring. Formal mentoring was used by one institution. The institution noted that the single mentor that worked with the professional development department was very important to the success of the program. He provided a source for pedagogical as well as technical information for faculty. He was also considered to be outside the political issues.

When discussing mentors during the interview, two institutions said that they would like to implement mentoring in the future. It is believed that this would give neophyte online instructors an experienced pedagogical resource.

Format. The workshops took place in campus computer labs and were led by members of the training department. Workshops were offered in a variety of ways by institutions. Most were offered in sequential order, although no requirements were made for faculty to attend all sessions or to attend in the proper order. The workshops were usually offered more than one time per semester so as to be available for a variety of schedules. An effort was made to have workshops available in the summer and one program focused on week-long summer seminars.

The flex-day workshops took three to four hours. These programs were attended by up to 15 faculty members. The workshop usually had one leader. Some institutions preferred, if possible, to have other professional development staff available to work in the room and help faculty one-on-one. Extra staff were considered a key ingredient to a successful workshop.

Appropriate Components, Content, and Format for the Program

The second research question asked the appropriate components, content, and format for the program. Information gathered through the initial research process reviewing the literature, and surveying and interviewing institutions to gather the best practice based information was analyzed and used to establish this.

The information from the literature and the analysis of model programs provided the basis for the identification of the criteria and appropriate components, content, and format of the program. Since considerable variations exist in terms of the components, content, and program format, it was essential to choose what would be appropriate for the Saddleback College community. In choosing appropriate features, current programming, cost, and personnel also needed to be considered.

Program Criteria

After analyzing the literature and the survey and interview results, a draft of criteria for appropriate program components, content, and format was fashioned. The criteria were reviewed and validated through a formative and summative committee process. The draft was first submitted to the formative panel. The formative panel did not suggest modifications to the draft. The summative panel then reviewed the draft of the criteria. The suggestion was made that the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) section 508 be included in the legal content of any program designed. The criteria were modified and the draft,resubmitted. No further suggestions were made.

The criteria (see Appendix F) designated that a viable program should consist of the Blackboard™ basics which would include basic program features, navigation, and a focus on the communication features of the program that are generally considered more advanced. Other criteria were to produce a program that consists of teaching activities and methods to take advantage of the features that computer-based teaching offers regarding teaching and learning styles. Moreover, reviews of students learning styles should be included with a focus on how to meet the needs of different types of learners in a virtual classroom. Legal issues pertaining to the World Wide Web and online course teaching should be included.

The criteria designated that activities in the program should include a review of the teacher's traditional classroom activities focusing on what can be utilized effectively in the virtual classroom while choosing alternative methods for teaching objectives that cannot be duplicated. The program should be developed so that faculty may take any one of the workshops without the workshop conflicting with faculty schedules. The program should also include introductory materials.

The program to support the faculty in creating online courses was developed to address all of the criteria identified and validated. The program was reviewed and validated by seeking the formative and summative committee input and making modifications to address the comments.

Saddleback College Blackboard™ and Online Course Program

The program was designed based on the information obtained from the literature, the surveys, and interviews. The validated criteria were considered and the draft of the program incorporated the appropriate program components, content, and format to address the criteria. The program draft was submitted to the formative committee for consideration. The formative committee suggested that the names of the workshops be changed to reflect the recommended sequence in which the workshops should be taken. The names were changed based on this suggestion. There were no further modifications suggested. One panel member commented, "...this will be a terrific contribution to our Distance Education program at Saddleback."

The revised draft was submitted to the summative panel for validation. The summative panel agreed that the program addressed the established criteria. Positive comments including the following were made: "In looking over the three areas, it looks like you are addressing all pertinent areas." However, it was recommended that additional information regarding the ADA be provided. One panel member stated:

> I think you should mention more information on alternate media for ADA compliance. For the future, 2006 and beyond, all video graphic media with pictures and sound will be required to have closed caption for the hearing impaired if offered to the public is just one example of legislation in place to protect the rights of students with disabilities.

Information about the ADA including readings and web sites were incorporated into the tutorial. The revised program draft was submitted for further summative committee review. The feedback from the committee members was positive. One panel member stated: "Other than that I enjoyed reading over your training program, and since I just recently finished two courses using Blackboard in the past month, I was able to visually see the steps you outlined in your module descriptions." Based on the overall positive comments and responses, the program was considered appropriate and valid.

Program Components

The information provided by those interviewed included not only what worked for their ongoing programs but also what components they would like to have added to their programs in the future.

The program components consist of a series of workshops that work in conjunction with online tutorials, a discussion board, and a mentoring program. The ITC has workshops offered regularly to the faculty to provide a variety of computer training. The three workshops will be offered throughout the semester as part of the ongoing program.

The ITC has a professional staff that currently leads workshops at Saddleback College. The staff will act as workshop leaders, running the workshops as part of their current training duties. One ITC staff member will be the primary workshop leader and act as a program leader to work with mentors and follow-up with paperwork and program evaluation. Mentors will aid the ITC staff during workshops, acting as technical and pedagogical support and group facilitators when necessary.

The workshops are the primary element of the program. Model programs in the literature review and at California community colleges depend on the workshops as the basis of their programs. The Saddleback College workshops are designed to introduce the faculty to the basic setup procedures for creating online courses, the communications features of online courses, and provide faculty with a broader concept base for creating legal and effective course sites.

The online tutorials are an important component to the workshops. The two are designed to be used together. The initial online tutorial is designed to be used by workshop participants prior to the first workshop. The focus of the tutorial is to help participants gather materials that will be necessary for creating an online course. This is intended to prepare the participants and enable the workshop leader to create a more productive experience for all involved.

The other online tutorials will actually be used during workshops. The workshops are designed to be longer in duration. Varying group tasks with individual tasks should create an environment to move the information along. The individual work will give those participants with more computer skills and experience a chance to progress and allow those with less experience to receive more support from workshop leaders and staff. While designed to be used within the workshop, the tutorials can be accessed after the workshop for review and follow-up at the discretion of the workshop leader.

The Saddleback College faculty need an open forum for discussing issues relating to creating and maintaining online courses. The Blackboard™ Discussion Thread (BDT) should be set up on the ITC course site that includes the other Blackboard™ tutorials/online workshops. All faculty should have access to the Blackboard™ discussion thread. The purpose of the Blackboard™ Discussion Thread is multiple: to provide answers to technical and pedagogical questions, to allow faculty to air frustrations or grievances, and to encourage professional growth through sharing ideas. The mentors' role is to facilitate these purposes. The BDT will be introduced at all workshops and linked on all Blackboard™ tutorials.

The BDT will enable Saddleback Faculty to create their own discussion threads regarding issues that they have or they may follow the threads regarding questions similar to their own. Faculty will also be able to answer questions or add comments to any discussion thread. This sort of informal mentoring should be encouraged.

The BDT will be monitored by the ITC staff mentors as well as the faculty mentors. Each mentor should check the BDT board each day. Comments as well as questions should be immediately addressed.

If a mentor has no answer for a query he/she should bring this to the attention of other mentors. He/she could also provide optional resources for ferreting out answers (i.e. the Blackboard™ web site.)

Mentors should also begin discussion threads on the BDT. They should address new theories in online teaching that may interest Saddleback faculty members. They may also add threads answering questions that have been presented in one-on-one questions or during workshops. Mentors also could begin threads to encourage faculty in such areas as brainstorming online classroom activities or multi-media online classroom options.

The ITC staff at Saddleback College will, as part of their current positions, act as technology mentors to the Saddleback faculty. They do this currently, acting as workshop leaders and also one-on-one tutors as needed. These mentors should be responsible for assisting faculty in navigating the Blackboard™ program and aiding them in inputting, uploading, and designing the course sites.

Course mentors can be successfully derived from the Saddleback faculty who are experienced Blackboard™ users. The course mentors can aid not only in site creation but are also able to give first hand experience dealing with actual students online. The novice online faculty can utilize experiences of knowledgeable faculty members to gather ideas and request advice.

Both types of mentors should not only be available to meet with novice faculty one-on-one or in small groups as requested, but also should be responsible for monitoring the Blackboard™ Discussion Thread.

All mentors will communicate regularly with the ITC staff member, designated as the Blackboard™ project coordinator. The Blackboard™ project coordinator will be one of the ITC technology mentors and a workshop leader.

Program Content

Program content varied greatly through the model programs. Programs such as UMUC had broad content that included technology training, web research, and legal issues (SchWeber et al., 1998) while other programs focused on basic computer applications training (Smith, 2000) or Blackboard™ program training (California Community College Interview, 2001). The community colleges noted in interviews that they were looking to expand the content of the programs to focus on such ideas as learning styles and alternative assessments.

The program content was gathered via the literature review and the California community colleges that were interviewed. The Saddleback program is designed to include topics that are being addressed by the model programs as well as broader issues identified by the review of the literature. Each of the workshops is designed to reinforce what has been learned in prior workshops.

The basis for each of the first two workshops is the Blackboard™ program itself. Materials used in these workshops were derived in part from Blackboard™ materials provided by the company.

The *How Do I Get Started?* online tutorial is completed by workshop participants prior to the workshop session. This online tutorial prepares faculty workshop participants for the Basic Blackboard™ Introduction workshop. It focuses on gathering and creating digitized course documents that will be necessary in online course design.

The first workshop is a Basic Blackboard™ Introduction (BBI): The objective is to learn the basic steps in creating an online course using Blackboard™. The workshop utilizes computers during the entire workshop. Understanding Blackboard™ course navigation and practicing navigation during the workshop will help faculty be more comfortable creating online courses. The Basics Online Tutorial will be utilized in conjunction with this workshop. The tutorial has two parts that are included in the activities portion of the workshop. The templates that are currently available to Saddleback College faculty from the ITC staff web site may also be incorporated.

Participants conclude the initial workshop by accessing the Legal Issues Tutorial (LIT). This tutorial is designed to inform faculty participants of fair use laws regarding copyrighted materials as well as their own rights to materials created for online courses. It also includes information pertaining to the Americans' with Disabilities Act, section 508 regarding access for online courses. The ADA section was enlarged at the suggestion of the summative panel. This tutorial has readings and web sites with relevant information.

The objective of the second workshop, Basic Blackboard™ Communication (BBII) is to teach faculty how to navigate the more advanced communication features of Blackboard™. These features have been isolated into a separate workshop as they are often the features with which faculty computer users have the least experience. The communication features include email, discussion thread, virtual classroom (chat), and the electronic drop box. The faculty will learn how each of these features works and how to use each one effectively in the online course.

Using the Computer to Advantage (BBIII) teaches how online computer technology is used to effectively meet the needs of a diverse student body with a variety of learning styles. The *Learning Styles Tutorial* (LST) will be used to introduce ideas and/or refresh knowledge of common student and teacher learning styles and how these different styles can be effectively accommodated in the online classroom. The workshop will be taught so as to review different parts of the Blackboard™ program while incorporating new ideas into faculty online course sites.

This topic was derived in part through a discussion with a formative committee member prior to the model program review process. The committee member noted that the Saddleback College faculty did not, in her opinion have difficulty learning the Blackboard™ program, but rather did not understand clearly how to translate traditional classroom methods into the online classroom format. It was also discussed in the literature.

A fourth Blackboard™ workshop is offered at the end of the semester. The objective of this workshop is to review Blackboard™ with faculty who are having difficulty with the Blackboard™ program or with designing the online course site. The workshop is designed to be open-ended. It will address issues specifically requested by the faculty participants. There will also be a review of issues that have been seen repetitively on the Blackboard™ Discussion Thread.

Mentoring and Blackboard™ Discussion Thread content will be determined by the faculty participants. These components are designed as individual support. Staff and faculty mentors will be available to answer both technical program and pedagogical questions regarding Blackboard™ and online course design. The Blackboard™ Discussion Thread will be checked daily for technical and pedagogical questions and comments.

Program Format

The format for the Saddleback College program is designed to be simple and fit into an existing structure within the ITC. The workshops will be offered in the same way that workshops are currently available. Faculty will receive the workshop schedule via the brochure sent out by the ITC. The workshops are designed to be three-hour workshops. The workshops are designed to be attended in the order given. Although workshop attendance is flexible as some faculty may not have the time, it is the intent that all workshops be attended.

The format was determined primarily through the interviews with other California community colleges. The focus of the programs was to utilized programs and personnel already in existence. This limited the need for new funding and further training of new staff.

The length of the workshops varied greatly from institution to institution. This again was part of the existing professional development structure of each institution. The key was to incorporate the programs into the existing structure. Another focal point was flexibility. If possible, the workshops should be able to be broken down into shorter segments. The *caveat* for the shorter segments was that oftentimes it was difficult for faculty to return for the workshops that were shorter in duration but spread throughout more days. So the program was designed to be one long workshop; however, they are able to be broken down into shorter segments if so desired.

The workshops are designed to be flexible in meeting the needs of the Saddleback College community. The agendas are written so that they may be easily broken down into shorter modules and offered during shorter time periods.

Each workshop is designed to be led by a workshop leader from the ITC. The first workshop may be conducted with only the ITC mentor leading. If possible, faculty mentors should be available to support the workshop leader and the neophyte faculty computer users. The content of the workshop is set by the agenda. While it is important it be flexible and attempts to answer questions beyond the set program, the content and agenda are set to fit within a specified time.

The second workshop will also have a mentor leader from the ITC staff. It is necessary that there be support mentors from either the ITC mentors or faculty mentors to work with faculty in groups. The number of additional mentors will be determined by the number of faculty attending the workshop. The third workshop will also require additional mentors to work with groups. Unlike the first workshop, the second and third workshops offer more flexibility with content. The second workshop has exercises built-in that will allow the faculty participants to practice using the Blackboard™ program's communication features while discussing questions they may have regarding the programs use or pedagogy. The third workshop is designed to specifically aid faculty in creating meaningful courses that use the computer to advantage; however, if there are technical questions during the program, time may be taken to address these issues.

The workshops each have an agenda with appropriate materials that may be copied and handed out prior to the workshop. The agenda specifies set-up for the workshop leader to complete prior to the program regarding hardware and software needs, user set-up, and materials to be made available. The fourth workshop has no set agenda regarding content. The mentors are expected to provide insight into common questions and difficulties regarding the Blackboard™ program and online course development. Faculty attending the fourth workshop will also be expected to communicate their specific needs for further training. The agenda will then be designed with regard to first technical issues that are most common then common pedagogical issues.

The workshops and tutorials will be input into Blackboard™ course sites. This will give workshop and tutorial participants hands-on experience with the Blackboard™ program. The workshop participants will experience the program as both student and instructor. This was noted as helpful during interviews with the community colleges; giving the instructor the student experience to create more empathy for the student user. The workshops also include large group work with all of the workshop participants, small group work, and individual work. Not only is this designed for aiding the learning of different levels of computer users but also allows the participants to build on experiences and gather course site ideas from other workshop participants.

The importance of mentors was referred to in model programs in the literature review (Albaugh & Knight, 1997; SchWeber et al., 1998; Smith, 2000); however, they were not common in the California community college programs. Mentoring was considered a one-on-one task associated with the professional development staff. The one institution that had a formal faculty mentor regarded his input highly and believed that he was a foundation to the success of faculty professional development program for creating online courses. He fulfilled a need as a teaching peer for both technological and pedagogical issues and he remained outside of the political arena of administration. He also had experience teaching with the program thus giving him a unique perspective.

During the interviews other institutions noted that they would like to implement mentor programs. One institution had faculty trained with the expectation of them acting as mentors and it did not work out. The time factor was noted as a difficulty. Faculty mentors were not compensated and had difficulty finding time to work as mentors and maintaining their course loads.

The Saddleback College mentor program is designed to have a number of faculty who are experienced Blackboard™ users and course site creators act as support for neophyte course site designers and computer users. The mentors will be responsible for keeping track of mentoring hours and submitting these to the ITC program coordinator. The mentors will have their names, office locations, office telephone numbers, and office hours published by the ITC for the benefit of faculty who need help. ITC staff may also recommend faculty directly to faculty mentors and provide names to the mentors and ask them to aid new Blackboard™ users. Mentors, ITC staff and faculty, are not limited to working with faculty workshop participants. Faculty creating online courses and not choosing to take the workshops may be guided to mentors for support.

The Blackboard™ Discussion Thread will be available through the workshop web sites. Initial threads will be from the Blackboard™ workshops. Faculty participants will have full access to the course site with the discussion thread after the workshops. They may add questions and comments at will. The BDT will be monitored by faculty and staff mentors on a regular basis. Mentors will be expected to note recurring themes and problems and forward these to the ITC program coordinator for use in the Blackboard™ Review workshop. Faculty who are not participating in workshops but who are creating online courses will be offered access to the workshop course sites and invited to participate in the discussion thread.

Program Implementation

Criteria

The California community college interviews provided the basis for the criteria for the implementation for the program. The program should be implemented as an integral part of the current professional development course offerings. It should need minimal funding. The program should be flexible so that the ITC may easily create shorter workshops if necessary. The program should also be available to fulfill faculty flex-day credits. The draft of the criteria was submitted to the formative committee. No revisions were suggested. The summative committee reviewed the draft and recommended no changes.

Implementation

The implementation of the Saddleback College Blackboard™ and Online Course Program was designed to meet the criteria developed. The draft of the program implementation was part of the draft of the course program. The formative committee reviewed the draft and recommended no modifications. The draft was submitted to the summative committee. The committee agreed that the program implementation met the criteria and validated the program.

The program to support Saddleback Faculty in creating online courses will be implemented through the Saddleback ITC. The brochures that advertise the semester offerings of workshops for faculty will include the program to support the creation of online courses. The workshops will run through the semester. If time permits more than one session of the workshop will be available. However, multiple sessions of one workshop will precede the following workshops. It is recommended that the workshops count toward contractual faculty professional development requirements.

Faculty sign-up will be voluntary. It will be done through the ITC via email or telephone. Sign-up prior to workshops will be mandatory as participants will need to have their names and user identifications submitted to create student and instructor accounts for the purpose of the workshops. Participants will be informed of the online tutorials that are to be completed prior to the workshops. The Blackboard™ Instructor Manual and basic computer information sheets will be sent to the workshop participants prior to the workshop.

The ITC staff at Saddleback College will, as part of their current positions, act as technology mentors to the Saddleback Faculty. They do this currently, acting as workshop leaders, and also one-on-one as needed. These mentors should be responsible for assisting faculty in navigating the Blackboard™ program and aiding them in inputting, uploading, and designing the course sites.

Course mentors will be successfully derived from the Saddleback faculty who are experienced Blackboard™ users. The course mentors can aid not only site creation but are also able to give first hand experience as to dealing with actual students online. The novice online

Faculty can utilize experiences of knowledgeable faculty members to gather ideas and request advice.

Both mentors should not only be available to meet with novice faculty one-on-one or in small groups as requested, but also should be responsible for monitoring the Blackboard™ Workshop Question Thread discussion (Please see Blackboard™ Discussion Thread p.3)

All mentors will communicate regularly with the ITC staff member who is designated the Blackboard™ project coordinator. The Blackboard™ project coordinator will be one of the ITC technology mentors and a workshop leader.

The ITC staff has an excellent staff. In the interest of creating the most convenient and best support for the Saddleback faculty the staff should assign three staff members to work with the faculty on a regular basis. These three should currently be leading Blackboard™ workshops and are the workshop leaders referred to in the outlined program.

The faculty member mentors should be volunteers recommended by department chairs and/or ITC staff who have been working with the faculty on the Blackboard™ project already. The faculty members should have at least 1 full year of experience with an online course and an interest in working with other faculty members. There should be at least five different faculty members from various departments.

The ITC staff will calendar one-on-one sessions and these can be used to create a needs assessment for online faculty and help the ITC better meet the technology needs of the Saddleback College faculty who are creating online courses. The ITC staff will monitor the Blackboard™ Workshop Question Threads. ITC staff will primarily be responsible for replying to any questions regarding the Blackboard™ software usage. However, being familiar with Blackboard™ and with multiple course sites the staff may also suggest resources to answer pedagogical questions or give successful pedagogical examples. The calendars and any pertinent discussion will be written out and emailed to the designated ITC staff member.

The faculty mentors will have set hours designated to mentoring. They will act as support to the ITC staff during Blackboard™ Workshops and may lead workshops if they feel comfortable doing so. They will actively follow-up with novice course designers after a workshop. The mentors will note the follow-up time and date and any discussion that would reflect on better providing information and instruction during the workshops. This will be emailed to the designated ITC staff.

Both faculty and staff mentors would be reviewed per the Saddleback College professional review system by their supervisors. Faculty and staff supervisors would request information regarding mentor hours calendared, hours on Blackboard™ Workshop Question Thread, in person workshops and one-on-one mentoring. ITC staff mentors and Faculty mentors will be listed on all Blackboard™ tutorial web sites with email, office telephone number, and office location with office hours posted.

It is not uncommon for a college's technology staff to mentor the faculty as part of their support positions. While the mentoring services from this group are invaluable this should still be considered part of their workload and the mentoring should be divided equitably as any project for this group. No additional funding is necessary.

While it is understood that many faculty are willing to devote their own time to mentoring colleagues, a mentor program can be time consuming. To enable faculty to consistently have time for their colleagues faculty needs to be offered compensation. There are several options that should be considered for compensating the mentor faculty. The mentoring could be added into the faculty workload as fulfillment of flex hours or the equivalent of teaching one two-unit course assignment. Faculty would be responsible for fulfilling commensurate time to equal this. Another option is that stipend could be offered to the faculty member to compensate for time spent mentoring other faculty. A third option is that the faculty member could receive professional advancement credit.

Program Evaluation

Criteria

The program evaluation was discussed at length during the interview with the California community college interviewees. The criteria for this product are an on-going evaluation with one party assigned to follow-up on the evaluation. The preference is to have the evaluation on-line, if possible, as an integral part to the program. There should be a way to disseminate the evaluation information to the interested parties to discuss and evaluate the program. The criteria was submitted to the formative committee. No revisions were recommended. The draft of the criteria was reviewed by the summative committee. No changes were suggested and the draft was considered valid by the panel.

Evaluation

The program evaluation was designed to address the validated criteria. The draft of the evaluation program was submitted with the Saddleback College Blackboard™ and Online Course Program. The formative committee suggested "looking at the course product and teaching effectiveness as an assessment." This suggestion became the second part of the program assessment in which course evaluations of implemented online courses are used to provide feedback regarding online faculty skills and training needs. This component was added to the assessment program. There were no further suggestions from the formative committee and the program was found to meet the criteria. The draft was submitted to the summative committee. It was determined to meet the designated criteria and validated by the panel.

There is a need to have ongoing assessment for the program to support online course development so that the ITC can determine that it is meeting the needs of the faculty desiring to create online courses. Ongoing assessment will also help the ITC determine any further needs that the faculty developing online courses might have. At the end of each workshop a standard ITC survey will be given to evaluate the training provided at the current workshop and determine what further information would be desired. The ITC mentor will review all surveys and make appropriate recommendations for further program training based on these surveys. Each online tutorial will also contain a brief survey regarding the information provided and further information desired on each topic.

The program assessment will be in survey format. The survey will be loaded onto the workshop course site. At the end of each workshop participants will be asked to complete the online survey.

The ITC currently has post-workshop evaluation forms. These forms will be put online and workshop participants will fill them out at the completion of each workshop. The California community colleges that were interviewed stated that the evaluations that were used for the professional development programs for faculty creating online courses were the same as for other workshops offered. These were found to be effective means of program assessment. It was noted that reviewing the evaluations and considering changes based on the evaluations is important. One interviewee felt that his institution had not followed-up on the evaluation forms readily and that a regular review of the evaluations would enhance the program.

A second assessment component is the course evaluations of actual online courses. Evaluations of courses that were designed by workshop and tutorial participants will be gathered by the ITC Blackboard™ project coordinator. After the evaluations are completed by the students an aggregate copy of the evaluations for each course will be forwarded to the ITC to aid in formative professional development assessment of the program to support the faculty in creating online courses.

Chapter 5

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Discussion

"Creating lessons and courses for distance learning is not a trivial activity and it is not merely a matter of applying distance learning technologies to a successful traditional classroom lesson" (Dooley, Edmundson, & Hobaugh, 1997, p. 31). The purpose of this applied dissertation research study was to create a program to support the development of online courses for Saddleback College faculty. The principles of the development methodology, including the formative and summative review processes were applied to design and validate a program to support the faculty in creating online courses, a plan to implement the program, and a plan to evaluate the program.

Data Gathering: Building Criteria

The review of pertinent literature provided a framework for the program design. The review included concerns of distance education programs, legal issues, professional development, model programs, and teaching and learning styles. Each of these areas was researched with computer-based technology instruction as the focus of the review. Model programs were especially useful in determining what content the survey instrument and the follow-up interview would contain. The objective was to elicit pertinent information regarding established programs. The belief was that established programs would have content, format, successes, and difficulties similar to those models in the initial literature review.

The literature review provided a basis for gathering data through a survey and interview with California community colleges. The use of surveying other institutions to gather information regarding program components is not unusual. At the University of Minnesota the faculty needs were assessed using a survey of practitioners and a content analysis of current training materials from other institutions (Kochery, 1997). The Saddleback College survey and interview were designed to gather information from California community colleges that are using the Blackboard™ program and have professional development programs in place to aid the faculty to create online courses. The California community colleges currently using the Blackboard™ program provided excellent models as they are regulated by the same rules that govern Saddleback College.

The survey was administered via mail to 25 California community colleges. The institutions were contacted via telephone to encourage the program administrators to reply to the survey. It was returned by 16 (64.0%) institutions. The survey provided basic information to decide which institutions should be invited to be interviewed. The institutions that had current professional development programs developed for the support of faculty teaching online were chosen to be interviewed. Four institutions agreed to complete the interview process.

The interviews with the community colleges were conducted in August, 2001. Each interview took approximately one hour to complete. All of the interview participants initially noted that there were no technical or pedagogical difficulties that their programs specifically addressed. However, during discussion generated by the interview items, participants noted that some faculty had difficulty translating objectives taught in the traditional classroom to the online format. Several said that the interview discussion had given them new ideas to work with to create more effective workshops for their institutions' faculties. The interviews were structured, however, discussion did go beyond the interview items. This report contains the responses gathered concerning the structured follow-up interview items.

Criteria

Program

The program criteria were developed based on the information from the literature review, surveys, and interviews. When interviewing the California community colleges, program administrators said that the professional development was often developed as needed without a plan. As new elements were needed, they were created and added. A strategic plan with program criteria was not developed. Using the information gathered, criteria were established for each of the products of this study.

The literature review provided examples of programs that trained faculty to use the computer technology applications (Albaugh & Knight, 1997, Smith, 2000) while others described curriculum based approaches that focus on teaching units (Bybee & Loucks-Horsley, 2000); however, workshop content for both types of programs often includes both. The UMUC has combined both into well-developed extensive workshops which include applications, web research, information technology, as well as effective writing to aid the faculty (SchWeber et al., 1998). Other programs, such as the University of Melbourne, focus on alleviating technophobia amongst the faculty (Mason, 1996).

The validated program criteria includes guidelines for program content. The content criteria includes Blackboard™ basics with basic features, navigation, and communication included. Introductory materials from the Blackboard™ site are incorporated. The interviews conducted support the importance of training faculty to use the Blackboard™ program with a focus on the communication features. According to the interview participants, the communication features, such as the discussion thread and virtual classroom, were considered to be the most challenging for the faculty.

Other content criteria includes alternative teaching methods to enhance computer usage and review of student learning styles with ideas for supporting a diversity of learning styles, and knowledge of the limitations of student equipment. Ross and Schultz (1999) discuss the importance of using computers to address different learning styles. The great advantage is that the world wide web can easily accommodate different learning styles and meet individual learning needs. The criteria delineates that the faculty need to review what activities they currently use to determine how course objectives can be met using alternative activities. The importance of teaching and learning styles in technology is also emphasized in Grasha and Yangarber-Hicks (2000), Whitehead (2000), and Ebeling (2001). It is agreed that the computer can enhance learning by providing a more flexible learning environment.

The inclusion of legal issues regarding distance education is considered to be important to the program. Gallant (2000) suggests that not only are legal issues such as copyright, fair use, and course ownership important to faculty training, but also that the faculty should have the information prior to using the new technology. The Americans with Disabilities Act requires entities, including community colleges, to ensure that communications with persons of disabilities are as effective as communications with others (Distance Education Accessibility Workgroup, 1999). This law is applied to distance education. Faculty need to know how to use alternative media to meet the needs of any student taking an online course. West (1999) lists lack of policies regarding intellectual property as one of the barriers to faculty participation in distance education.

Finally, the program needs to be accessible and the faculty should be able to take the workshops out of sequence or select only some programs. While frustrating for the trainers conducting training programs, the interview participants made it clear that faculty needed the ability to take workshops out sequence with no requirement to attend all of the workshops provided.

Implementation

The criteria for the implementation of the program were based on the information from the review of model programs and the literature. The criteria state that the program should be implemented as current ITC programming is implemented and should be a part of the ongoing offerings at Saddleback College. The interview participants explained that the programs were offered as part of their current schedule of professional development courses. These programs were incorporated into the offerings of the existing series of workshops and faculty signed-up for workshops in the same way.

The program should be implemented with minimal additional funding, however, funding or compensation for faculty mentors should be included. The University of Maryland University College utilizes staff who are responsible for professional development as part of their current position, so no further compensation is required (SchWeber et al., 1998) as does the Teachers Software Institute (Albaugh & Knight, 1997). Generally, faculty are not compensated for peer training as part of their responsibilities. West (1999) suggests that this is why faculty are reluctant to be involved in mentoring and training; the time and effort provided are often not considered as part of the tenure and promotion process. West suggests that including such things as release time could encourage more involvement in programs. Van Tassell (1999) adds the importance of faculty being rewarded for all contributions to an institution including professional development.

The program should be implemented so that faculty can receive flex-day credits as compensation for participation. It was standard at the institutions interviewed for faculty to attend during flex-day sessions.

The program should be implemented in a time-flexible manner: the program should be able to be implemented into shorter or longer time blocks if necessary. Finally, implementation should include compensation for faculty mentors.

Evaluation

The criteria for the program assessment were also derived from the information gathered from the model programs and the review of the literature. In their model teacher-training program Williams et al. (1994) point out that the survey at the end of the training program helps the institution respond to the teachers' training needs. The programs reviewed in the literature utilized a number of methods to evaluate programs including interviews (Smith, 2000), adjunct faculty retention (SchWeber et al., 1998), and program re-enrollment (Albaugh & Knight, 1997).

The interviews provided a more practical evaluation. The institutions all used the current workshop evaluations that are used for other professional development programs in the school. Some of the institutions noted that the information from the submissions was not utilized. There were a variety of reasons for this. The Saddleback College assessment should be online and ongoing throughout the workshops and tutorials provided by the program. The program assessment information should be gathered by one designated individual who is responsible for analyzing the information and disseminating pertinent information with regard to the program and possible changes. The criteria were designed to ameliorate the difficulties that other institutions had regarding collection, analysis, and use of data for formative evaluation purposes.

Program Components, Content, and Format

Components

The program developed to support the Saddleback faculty in creating online courses in many ways resembles the model programs. The program created includes workshops, online tutorials, discussion thread, and a mentor program. The workshops and online tutorials were both components prominently featured in the model programs. These components included a variety of content. They are perceived as an effective way to disseminate information to the faculty regarding the software program use and other broader issues.

The workshop agendas are step-by-step and in several chunks so that the workshops can be broken into shorter workshops. The online tutorials are used for both pre-workshop preparation as well as for individual work during the workshop. The online tutorials allow the workshop leader to work individually with faculty who need more help while more advanced faculty can work at a faster pace. This differs slightly from the model programs that use the online tutorials strictly outside of the workshop as individual instructional aids.

The use of the discussion thread was identified in the literature review as well as by one of the California community college programs. Naidu (1997) discusses the use of discussion thread to guide both teachers and students in online courses. The discussion thread was only used in one model program in conjunction with the faculty-mentor. The discussion thread is an excellent way to gather feedback and offer ongoing support for faculty. It is also a method of gathering data to review program needs for program assessment. The discussion thread also allows the faculty participants to act as mentors to others in the program. The discussion thread can be valuable as a tool for venting frustration with peers.

Mentor programs are considered an important aspect in professional development. Holloway (2001) notes that both mentors and mentees respond favorably to the mentoring process. Mentoring programs are also cited as deterring attrition of instructors from programs. This is an issue with online course development as many instructors do not continue with such courses through frustration with the program and process of developing the online course. Mentor programs, while discussed widely in professional development literature, were not common in the model programs. Only two programs, one in the literature and one California community college, had a mentor program. Despite the lack of mentoring as a strategy used in model programs, a mentor component was included in the Saddleback College program. Both of the model programs with mentors noted the value of the mentors to their faculty and as an aid for online course faculty retention. Knight and Albaugh (1997) discuss their concern that professional development programs are designed by those who have little understanding of what teachers want or need and that programs have little or no follow-up help from developers (p. 2). The faculty-mentor is intended to bring the pedagogical information to the professional development training.

The mentor program was recommended by two California community college programs that do not currently have mentors. They believed that if a mentor program were possible, it could benefit their programs in the future. Peer mentoring as well as mentoring from the technical staff were considered important.

Content

The program content mimics the model programs with its basis in training on the software technology used by the institution. The basics of how to navigate the course site are practiced using hands-on training. The content includes pre-workshop training to enhance the experience using an online tutorial. The content of the three workshops optimally builds from one to the other.

The first workshop is intended to introduce the software program and help faculty set up a course site using the software program basics. Learning where information is stored and how to add information is included. The model programs address all of these fundamentals and have workshops to specifically learn the communications features of the Blackboard™ program. Because the virtual classroom, email, and drop box for assignments were noted as problem spots for faculty, these topics were incorporated into the program.

The review of the literature provided the basis for the legal issues tutorial which is included in the initial workshop. One of the concerns of modern institutions is that faculty understand and not deliberately violate copyright and fair use doctrine. Colyer (1997) emphasizes the need for faculty to be educated. She further recommends that the faculty development program address this issue. There is a great concern that online courses would publish copyrighted material. If there is no attempt to disseminate the information about fair use, the institutions could be held accountable. In Marcus v. Rowley, 695 F.2d 1171 (9th Cir. 1983) the court opinion emphasized that a person need not have sold or profited from copyright materials to have violated copyright law. The "Criminal Penalties for Copyright Infringement" (Pub. L. No. 102-561, 106 Stat. 4233) directly relates copyright felony and illegal dissemination of copyrighted materials to computer usage (Kaplin & Lee, 1995). The inclusion of the legal issues tutorial is designed to make the faculty creating online courses aware of the copyright issue and give them direction if there are questions regarding the materials being used for the course.

The question of course ownership and copyright of materials is also part of this discussion. The review of the literature, the California community college interviews, and the formative committee reactions all support the decision to consider this as an important issue. Faculty are often surprised to learn that materials created for online courses are owned by the college. Course creation is governed by work for hire. To know this prior to creating a course and materials, and to understand why ownership is retained by the institution, will hopefully alleviate dissatisfaction and frustration that may arise if discovered after the fact.

The initial program criteria did not include information regarding ADA and equal access. The addition was proposed during the criteria review by the summative committee. The importance of equal access is an issue that is being reviewed by institutions that have online courses. It is important that faculty understand that ADA pertains to online courses and that courses must provide accessibility to meet section 508 of ADA. To address this need, digital readings regarding ADA specifications and how to meet these specifications were added to the Legal Issues Tutorial.

The second workshop is devoted to navigating the course site and using the communication features of Blackboard™. Since the community colleges interviews revealed that the communication features were often the most difficult for faculty to utilize effectively, this workshop provides practice using the communication features. Using discussion thread, virtual classroom, and email as well as the electronic drop box are not intuitive. The workshop is designed so that faculty can gain experience from both the student and the instructor perspective. This workshop is designed to follow the BBI. It reviews Blackboard™ navigation while learning and practicing the Blackboard™ communication features.

The program content includes an entire workshop based on learning styles. This workshop was developed because of a concern initially expressed by a formative committee member. The member mentioned that although the Blackboard™ program could be learned, many faculty did not understand how to translate the traditional classroom to the online classroom. The third workshop focuses on developing alternative strategies for the online classroom as well as strategies for effectively implementing traditional teaching strategies. Rowntree (1998) and Kochery (1997) both recommend that distance learning courses should incorporate more cooperative strategies and use more materials. Hillesheim (1998) recommends that distance educators utilize user friendly materials that are interesting, appropriate, and relevant. To aid in the adoption of these ideas, the Using the Computer to Advantage (BBIII) workshop was developed. The information gathered from the literature led to the decision to have this workshop focus on strategies based in learning and teaching styles. This content was not evident in most of the model programs; however, it was deemed critical to the creation of more successful online courses.

Format

The workshop format and length were based on the suggestions from the interviews. These colleges had longer workshops offered during the professional development days. Also, workshops were offered in shorter time periods throughout the semester and faculty were not required to take them in sequential order. While a shorter time period was considered by some model programs to improve faculty involvement, it was also discussed that a greater number of workshops often meant fewer attendees at later sessions. This is why flexibility in the workshop agenda is important. The workshops should be broken down into shorter sessions if the ITC program coordinator feels that it might be beneficial or better fit into the schedule; however, success in attendance seems to stem from persuading faculty to attend workshops and covering the content in a single session. While it is optimal for faculty to attend the workshops in order, it is not essential.

The hands-on online format serves two purposes. It offers the faculty a chance to experience the program from both the teacher and the student points-of-view and it offers the faculty experience in working the software. Repetition and practice are how a skill is learned. The format of the professional development program was developed so that the faculty not only use the program during the Blackboard™ focused workshops but also during the broader issue based workshops. The emphasis is on practical application of the software program in the workshop, creating sites and materials that will be used later for the actual courses created. The model programs were all hands-on. The Saddleback program incorporates the hands-on approach as part of the broader issues workshops as well. Practicing as both teacher and student was considered helpful by the model programs as it helped the faculty to anticipate and support student difficulties with the software program at a later date.

Implementation

The model programs implemented their professional development programs with as much simplicity as possible. The workshops were added to current professional development offerings. Workshops were taught by staff currently involved in training faculty to use technology at their institutions. This also eliminated the need to fund outside consultants or trainers. This program is designed to be implemented in the same manner; except for faculty mentors, current funding will cover the cost of the program.

The ITC Blackboard™ coordinator and mentor staff will load the activities and materials onto course sites for each separate workshop. Suggested readings that are copyrighted will have links to the Saddleback library subscription service allowing participants to view them. If granted permission, the readings will be loaded directly onto the course site. The Blackboard™ Discussion Thread will only be part of the Blackboard™ Basic Introduction to eliminate any confusion on the part of participants. All participants of any of the workshops will have access to the BBI course site and appropriate site permissions to use the discussion thread. The discussion thread access is presented at the end of each of the workshops.

The workshops will take place on Saddleback College campus and will be offered through the ITC. The program will be advertised in the ITC brochure as part of the semester professional development workshops. It will be recommended that faculty participate in all of the workshops if they are anticipating creating an online course. Faculty will be required to sign-up prior to the workshops so that the ITC can set up the course site information necessary. Faculty participants will also receive a packet containing a copy of the course site information regarding the pre-workshop online tutorial preparing them for the initial workshop. ITC staff mentors will manage this.

The Saddleback program adds the element of one person coordinating the program to support the faculty in creating online courses. This aids implementation of the mentor program and facilitation of program evaluation. None of the model programs had a coordinator designated to fulfill this position. This approach should alleviate the difficulty that other programs experienced regarding collection and analysis of program evaluations as well as dissemination of the information for the purpose of program formative assessment.

Mentors must be chosen. ITC staff mentors will be selected by the ITC supervisor. Faculty mentors are volunteers who have at least one year experience actively using the Blackboard™ program and permission of their department chairperson to work with this program. Ganser (1999) encourages training and support for faculty mentors. It is important that faculty mentors have Blackboard™ experience and are comfortable with the program. It is also important that the ITC Blackboard™ coordinator work with the faculty mentors, supporting efforts with the mentees.

As faculty members do not in their normal course of duties spend large amounts of time mentoring colleagues, it is recommended that they receive compensation. Compensation in model programs comes in many forms; mentors could be paid contractually as if it were credit hours of teaching. Another approach would be to use funds allocated for the professional development budget that is generally used to fund conferences and outside consultants. Comp time was used by some programs, giving faculty one less course to teach, presuming that the extra time would be spent in active mentoring. Mentors are not typically looking for a fiscal reward, but they need the time to engage in mentoring activities (Ganser, 1999). Spending time working together is the focus of a mentor program. Release time compensation for mentors is encouraged in the literature so that mentors have the time to work with mentees.

Since it is recommended that the faculty portion of the mentor program offer either a fiscal or a temporal reward for participation, the program will require an approach to maintain accountability. The Blackboard™ coordinator should work with the faculty mentors to keep track of the time devoted by mentoring as well as to provide support for their efforts with the workshops and neophyte online teachers. The coordinator can give the participation information to the faculty mentor's department chairperson. The coordinator will also gather information from the mentors, both staff and faculty, for use in the formative program assessment of the program.

Evaluation

Program evaluation is an important component for any successful program. Programs may be evaluated by internal program staff or outside evaluators. The literature showed that outside evaluators were used most frequently in situations where there were multiple sites to evaluate (Knight & Albaugh, 1997). The evaluations were based on data gathered through surveys and observations of the faculty participants. The model programs used internal evaluation that was part of their on-going professional development program assessments.

The representatives of the colleges interviewed concluded that while evaluation was ongoing, the evaluations were not being reviewed with regularity and the program assessment approaches were not effective. An effective program needs to have on going evaluation processes and take action based on the data gathered. The recommendation was to have one person be responsible for the data collection, analysis, and dissemination of the findings. The Hogg Foundation (Keir & Millea, 1997) comments that although data collection should be shared with those working on the program, it should not over burden them.

The model program interviews indicated that faculty participants complete a standard workshop evaluation form at the conclusion of the workshops. The Saddleback College program will do the same; however, the evaluation form will be included online as part of the course site. This harkens back to repetition and practicing the program. It also allows the ITC Blackboard™ coordinator to gather the evaluations and analyze the data gathered with ease. The evaluations can also be available for faculty who may have had to exit the workshop early. It is available online as part of the workshop course site and faculty will have access to it for a designated time period. This will be established by the Blackboard™ program coordinator.

Finally, the ITC coordinator will gather the evaluation data from the workshops. Other evaluations will be conducted for the mentor program and the discussion thread. These two components will provide the ITC coordinator with information regarding frequently asked questions, or frequently misunderstood or difficult to use program components that may need additional or revised training in the professional development program. These approaches are consistent with the suggestions in the literature. "Project evaluation provides an opportunity for the staff and participants to assess or re-evaluate its priorities and structure" (Zeidler & LeBaron, 1997, p. 10). The ITC coordinator may also consult directly with the mentors for ideas based on experience in working with faculty participants.

Conclusions

The implementation of the procedures to address each of the four research questions produced outcomes that achieved the purpose of the study and addressed the problem that prompted the need for the study. The program designed to support the creation of online courses and the plans for implementation and evaluation were produced by this study. The viability and appropriateness of the program and plans is supported by the conclusions drawn for each of the four research questions. The overall conclusion of this applied dissertation is that the program and plans to implement and evaluate are valid and will support the creation of online courses by Saddleback College faculty. The conclusions are based on the outcomes of implementing procedures based on the application of the principles of the development methodology and the procedures to conduct the review of the literature and gather information about other faculty development programs and model programs. In addition, advisory formative and summative panels were employed in the development and validation of the instruments, criteria, and products of this research.

Effective Approaches

The initial research question was posed to prompt procedures to obtain information about effective faculty development approaches to assist faculty in the development of online courses. Based on the literature reviewed, survey information, and interview information about model programs, it was concluded that there are a variety of approaches utilized in effective professional development program to support faculty in creating online courses and the application of computer-based instructional technology. While the literature review provided few specific examples, the California community colleges interviewed provided a great deal of information regarding effective approaches.

The various strategies and approaches that were identified by this thorough review and the analysis of the information from the survey and the interviews formed the basis for the products and approaches produced by this research. The survey and interview approaches were developed and validated with the assistance of the advisory formative and summative panels. The interviews of individuals responsible for the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the model programs provided the opportunity to discuss the programs in depth. Although the approaches were diverse, the information gathered demonstrated that there are a number of common principles and viable components that should be incorporated into an effective faculty development program. The information gathered suggested that there are a number of ways to plan and implement an effective program and the programs offered need to be modified during implementation to meet the changing needs of the increasingly sophisticated computer-using faculty. From this determination also came the necessity for flexibility within a program. The existing model programs described various attempts and strategies to meet the diverse needs of their faculty including providing the components at a variety of times and repeating popular workshops. The observations based on the information from the literature and interviews support the conclusions that the Blackboard™ program coordinator must maintain flexibility in the program and continuing efforts need to be made to address the changing needs of the faculty. It was also concluded from the data gathered regarding model programs, that while the programs were considered effective within their own institutions, no one program would provide a definitive model. The interviews provided insight as to which components were desirable and how they could be implemented.

These "best practices" produced the foundation for the design of the program components. The thoroughness of the information gathering provides the rationale for concluding that the information gathered was appropriate to provide a framework for the program design.

Appropriate Components, Content, and Format

The second research question was addressed by implementing procedures to develop and validate the program for the faculty that will support the creation of online courses. The information pertaining to effective programs produced by the procedures implemented to address the initial research question was utilized as the basis for the criteria and the program for the faculty. The program designed was based on the information gathered with an effort to utilize the "best practices" and effective approaches identified from the reviews of the various programs and the literature.

The criteria were initially developed to reflect the components, content, and formats that were considered effective and most common in model programs. The formative and summative committees supported this design approach and the program was designed to feature workshops with hands-on experience, approaches to train faculty to use the features of Blackboard™, a mentor component, and online tutorials as well as content including legal issues and learning styles. The program also was designed to be incorporated into the existing professional development forum provided at Saddleback College using current personnel.

Consistent with the approaches utilized when applying the development methodology, the formative and summative review processes were employed to assist in the development and validation of the criteria for the program as well as the components, content, and format of the faculty development program. The conceptual base for the program was endorsed by the review panels and they were utilized in the review of the program as it was created and proposed. Based on the thoroughness of the information gathered to form the basis for the program and the application of the development methodology processes to develop and validate products, it is concluded that the program is both appropriate and valid for the faculty at Saddleback College.

Program Implementation

The third research question prompted procedures to design a plan to implement the program. The literature and information about other programs was utilized to form the basis for the plan. Also, specific recommendations relating to program components were identified and incorporated into the plan. The information from other programs suggests that the implementation of the program should be through the set structure within the institution and that it is essential that efforts be made to limit the need for additional funding for this type of professional development program. Therefore, the plan for the implementation of the program utilizes the ITC staff and faculty who are already familiar with the Blackboard™ program. The plan calls for the incorporation of these approaches into the existing faculty development program. The plan for implementation also stipulates that the responsibility of mentorship needs to be taken outside the current contracts of the faculty mentors. Provisions need to be made to compensate faculty mentors with release time or money.

The formative and summative review processes were employed in the development of the criteria and the plan to implement the program. Since the content of the plan was based on the information from the review of the literature and the interviews of model program leaders and validated by the formative and summative panels, it was concluded that the implementation plan is appropriate and valid for use in the implementation of the program.

Program Evaluation

The fourth research question was addressed by developing an evaluation plan for use as the program is implemented. The literature and the model programs emphasize the importance of having ongoing program evaluation. Furthermore, it is important that the information gathered from participants be used to modify the program offerings. It was concluded from the interviews with model program leaders that participant reactions should be used as the basis for modifications of the programs to meet faculty needs and make improvements. The model program interviews suggested that the responsibility for the evaluation processes, including the analysis of the information and recommending changes, should be assigned to one individual. These features and others based on the information gathered were incorporated into the evaluation plan and the approaches that will be utilized.

The formative and summative review processes were employed in the development of the criteria and the plan to evaluate the program. Since the content of the plan was based on the information from the review of the literature and the interviews of model program leaders and validated by the formative and summative panels, it was concluded that the plan for evaluation of the program is appropriate and valid.

Implications

The ability to effectively use the available technology will enhance the opportunities at Saddleback College. A development team for the Department of Education, Washington DC created a mission statement and developed principles to support and guide the efforts of professional development. The statement not only focuses on individual improvement, but also collegial, and organizational improvement. According to the team, professional development must be ". . . driven by a coherent long-term plan" (U.S. Department of Education, 1996, p. 5). With an effective program in place, the Saddleback College faculty will be better able to create effective online courses.

It is anticipated that the program will enable faculty to accept the change in teaching format and enable them to use the new technology effectively. When faculty concerns about how to effectively use the technology have been addressed, the faculty will more readily accept the online courses. Resmer et al. (1995) notes that it is important that faculty accept the changes to using technology in education. This acceptance on the part of the faculty greatly influences use by the students. This will lead to students receiving a broader based education through the use of technology.

It is also anticipated that this program will effectively assist the faculty at Saddleback College to learn to utilize the Blackboard™ authorware system to create effective online courses. The ultimate outcome of this program will be seen in the creation of quality distance education courses for students who are unable to attend traditional courses on campus. In this manner Saddleback College may potentially offer educational opportunities to a broader base of students in addition to increasing opportunities through providing a more flexible course schedule to students currently attending on-campus courses.

Recommendations

Recommended Action

The program and the plans for implementation and evaluation were submitted to the Dean of Instruction with a series of recommendations (see Appendix G). The primary recommendation was that the program be implemented and utilized by the Saddleback College ITC for the purpose of professional development to support faculty creating online courses. It is recommended that the strategies and approaches contained in the implementation plan be followed. Although portions of the program could be selected for implementation, the program was designed to be offered in its entirety since the various components are interrelated. That is, each component supports the others in an effort to create a successful and flexible program to meet the needs of the Saddleback College faculty who are creating online courses. The ITC should be assigned responsibility for the program coordination and administration. A Blackboard™ program coordinator needs to be appointed and responsible for the coordination and evaluation of the program. The program should be integrated into the overall professional development program of the college.

The program includes a faculty mentor component. It is also recommended that faculty mentors identified should be compensated for their efforts which will require that they devote considerable amounts of time. The literature review and interview information suggests that successful mentoring programs compensate the mentors in some way. The mentoring could be incorporated into the faculty workload as fulfillment of flex hours or the equivalent of teaching one course. Another option would involve providing a stipend to the faculty member to compensate for time devoted to mentoring other faculty. A third option is that the faculty member could receive professional advancement credit. All of these compensation options will establish accountability conditions and the mentors should report hours and participation to the Blackboard™ program coordinator.

Since the program will need to be flexible and be modified as it is implemented, it is recommended that the program assessment and evaluation strategies identified in the evaluation plan be implemented. It is recommended that the program be evaluated after the initial implementation and appropriate modifications, if any, be made to the program based on the information gathered from the participants. It is further recommended that evaluation be constant and on-going during the implementation of the entire program. In order to know that the program is fulfilling the needs of the faculty, it is essential that the program evaluations be completed at the end of each workshop and that the Blackboard™ program coordinator review these at the completion of each workshop. It is recommended that the coordinator be specifically assigned this task so that the ongoing assessment is actually completed.

Efforts to review the operation of the Blackboard™ Discussion Thread (BDT) and the mentor program must also be initiated. It is the responsibility of the mentors to monitor the BDT as well as provide support to faculty beyond the online tutorials and workshops. Common needs for training and information should be communicated to the Blackboard™ program coordinator and possible program adjustments should ensue.

Since faculty who desire to participate in the Blackboard™ program may not have appropriate computer skills for creating and maintaining an effective online course, it is recommended that minimum computer competency guidelines be established for faculty wishing to participate in creating online courses and in the Blackboard™ workshops. Faculty development programs to address deficiencies in computer competence should be provided for these faculty.

Program Dissemination

It is recommended that the academic administrators including department chairpersons be provided with information about this program. Since the ITC will be responsible for the implementation of the program, the Blackboard™ program coordinator should initiate procedures to inform the faculty about the program and its components. The professional development program announcements will also be a mechanism that will disseminate information concerning the program. It is recommended that the Blackboard™ program coordinator meet with potential faculty and staff mentors. Program information, updates, and new information can be shared by program trainers and mentors through these regularly scheduled meetings. The meetings can also be used to disseminate information gathered through the program assessment and evaluation strategies as well as to discuss any potential program changes.

Dissemination of information about the program to other professionals can be initiated by the ITC staff and the Blackboard™ program coordinator. It is recommended that the Blackboard™ program coordinator contact other institutions that have created similar programs to share information about this program. California community college program directors asked many questions during the interview regarding other institutions and stated that they might work to implement ideas gathered form other institutions interviewed. This indicates that the sharing of ideas for this type of program can be helpful and lead to the development of more effective programming. It is recommended that efforts be made to provide program descriptions to other community colleges in California as well as through the Blackboard™ network. Participants in the survey and interviews should be provided with information about the nature of the program as it is implemented.

Further Research

The evaluation plan includes forms of evaluation that can be considered further research. For example, as areas of difficulty are identified, survey research could be implemented to determine the program modifications that may be needed. The communications with other colleges could include continuing efforts to identify effective approaches. Technological changes will require modifications to the program which suggests the need to continue to gather information about effective approaches. The achievement of student learning outcomes related to online delivery of courses cannot be ignored. It is recommended that the assessment efforts to determine the effectiveness of these courses be initiated since some instructional strategies may be more effective than others. If the quality of the learning opportunities should be maintained regardless of the instructional modalities, then this variable must not be ignored and should prompt research. Other topics for further research should include legal ramifications of online courses, incorporation of online activities to meet the needs of a diverse student body, and accessibility to all students for all activities.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Albaugh, P., & Knight, P. (1997). *Training technology mentors: A model for professional development.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 49th, Phoenix, AZ. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 406 334)

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. (2000, November). Better learning through science. *Educational Leadership, 58*(3), 96.

Bell, J. (1998, Summer). Problems in statistics: Learning style, age, and part-time students. *Education, 118*, 526-528.

Blackboard™ Inc. (1999). *Instructor manual.* Washington, DC: Author.

Bradley, A. (1996). *The missing link. Inquiring minds: Creating a nation of teachers and learners. An education week special report* (pp. 5-9). Washington, DC: Editorial Projects in Education, Inc. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 402 269)

Bybee, R. W., & Loucks-Horsley, S. (2000, October). Advancing technology education: The role of professional development. *The Technology Teacher, 60*(2), 31-4.

Chancellor's Office California Community Colleges. (2000, April). *Guidelines for producing instructional and other printed materials in alternate media for persons with disabilities.* Sacramento, CA: Author.

Caplan, J., Frances, C., & Pumerantz, R. (1999, July/August). Planning for instructional technology: What you thought you knew could lead you astray. *Change, 31*(4), 24-33.

Cartnal, R. B., & Diaz, D. P. (1999, Fall). Students' learning style in two classes: Online distance learning and equivalent on-campus. *College Teaching, 47*(4), 130-135.

Cifuentes, L., Davis, T., & Clark, S. (1996). *From sages to guides: A professional development study.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 397 036)

Colyer, A. (1997). Copyright law, the internet, and distance education. *The American Journal of Distance Education, 11*(3), 41-57.

Crooks, S. M., Klein, J. D., Savenye, W., & Leader, L. (1998, Spring). Effects of cooperative and individual learning during learner-controlled computer-based instruction. *The Journal of Experimental Education, 66*, 223-244.

Davies, M. A., & Wavering, M. (1999, Fall). Alternative assessment: new directions in teaching and learning. *Contemporary Education, 71*(1), 39-45.

Dirks, M. (1997). *Developing an appropriate assessment strategy: Research and guidance for practice.* Paper presented at the NAU/web.97 conference, Flagstaff, AZ. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 423 274)

Dirks, M. (1998). *How is assessment being done in distance learning?* Paper presented at the NAU/web.98 conference, Flagstaff, AZ. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 423 273)

Distance Education Accessibility Workgroup. (1999, August). *Distance education: Access guidelines for students with disabilities.* Sacramento, CA: Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges.

Dooley, K., Edmundson, C., & Hobaugh, C. (1997). *Instructional design: A critical ingredient in the distance education soup.* (Report). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 415 935)

Downs, M., & Moller, L. (1999, December 1). Experiences of students, teachers, and administrators in a distance education course. *International Journal of Educational Technology, 1*(2). Retrieved December 13, 2001, from http://www.outreach.uiuc.edu/ijet/v1n2/downs/index.html.

Duderstadt, J. J. (1999/2000, Winter). New roles for the 21st century university. *Issues in Science and Technology, 16*(2), 37-44.

Eastmond, D., & Granger, D. (1998). Using type II computer network technology to reach distance students. *Distance Education Report, 2*(3), 1-3, 8.

Ebeling, D. G. (2000, November). Adapt your teaching to any learning style. *Phi Delta Kappan, 82*, 247-248.

Ebeling, D. G. (2001, March). Teaching to all learning styles. *The Education Digest, 66*(7), 41-45.

Ely, D. (1996). *Distance education: By design or default?* Paper presented at the Conference of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology, Tallahassee, FL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 396 715)

Follows, S. B. (1999, November). Virtual learning environments. *T.H.E. Journal, 27*(4), 100

Gallant, G. M. (2000). Professional development for web-based teaching: Overcoming innocence and resistance. In E. J. Burge (Ed.) *The Strategic Use of Learning Technologies* (New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, No. 88, pp. 69-78). New York, NY: Jossey-Bass

Ganser, T. (1998, Winter). Metaphors for mentoring. *The Educational Forum, 62,* 113-119.

Gilbert, S., & Geoghegan, W. (1995, March). An "online" experience: Discussion group debates why faculty use or resist technology. *Change, 27*(2), 28.

Grasha, A. F., & Yangarber-Hicks, N. (2000). Integrating teaching styles and learning styles with instructional technology. *College Teaching, 48*(1), 2-10.

Harvey, J., & Purnell, S. (Eds.). (1995). *Technology and teacher professional development.* Washington, DC: Department of Education, Office of Education Technology. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 393 831)

Hegarty, J., Bostock, S., & Collins, D. (2000, July). Staff development in information technology for special needs: a new, distance-learning course at *British Journal of Educational Technology, 31*, 199-213.

Hillesheim, G. (1998). *The search for quality standards in distance learning.* Report in Distance Learning '98. Proceedings of the Annual Conference on Distance Teaching & Learning, 14th, Madison, WI. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 422 856)

Holloway, J. (2001, May). The benefits of mentoring. *Educational Leadership, 58*(8), 85-86.

Hurn, J., & Thibeault, N. (1996). *Bridging the multimedia generation gap.* Report presented in Association of Small Computer Users in Education (ASCUE) Summer Conference Proceedings, 29th, North Myrtle Beach, SC. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 405 834)

Innovation and Technology Center. (1998). *Innovation and technology center spring 1998 faculty and staff workshops.* Mission Viejo, CA: Saddleback College.

Iscoe, L. K. (1996). *Beyond the classroom: Experiences of a school-based services project.* Austin, TX: Hogg Foundation for Mental Health.

Kaplin, W., & Lee, B. (1995). *The law of higher education.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Karlen, J. M. (1994). *Technology and higher education: In debt, inept, and in loco parentis.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 380 004)

Keir, S., & Millea, S. (1997*). Challenges and realities: Evaluating a school-based services project.* Austin, TX: Hogg Foundation for Mental Health

Kochery, T. (1997). *Distance education: A delivery system in need of cooperative learning.* Report in proceedings of selected research and development presentations at the 1997 national convention of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology, 19th, Albuquerque, NM. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 409 847)

Lage, M. J., Platt, G. J., & Treglia, M. (2000, Winter). Inverting the classroom: A gateway to creating an inclusive learning environment. *The Journal of Economic Education, 31*(1), 30-43.

Levin, S. R., Waddoups, G. L., Levin, J., & Buell, J. (2001, January 27). Highly interactive and effective online learning environments for teacher professional development. *International Journal of Educational Technology, 2*(2). Retrieved December 13, 2001, from http://www.outreach.uiuc.edu/ijet/v2n2/slevin/index.html.

Mason, J. (1996). *Determining the scope of online delivery at a traditional research based university.* Report in Learning technologies: prospects and pathways. Selected papers from EdTech '96 biennial conference of the Australian Society for Educational Technology, Melbourne, Australia. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 396 731)

Mauro, T. (1999). Ginsburg critiques e-law school [Electronic version]. *New Jersey Law Journal.* Retrieved September 27, 1999, from http://www.lawnewsnetwork.com/stories/A6062-1999Sep20.html

McIlheran, S. J. (1997). Consumer's guide to choosing college courses on the internet. From http://www.drake.edu/iaicu/consumer_guide.html.

Mingle, J. R., Oblinger, D., & Resmer, M., (1995). *Computers for all students: A strategy for universal access to information resources.* Denver, CO: SHEEO. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 394 401)

Moursund, D. (1999, April). Enhancing your opportunities to learn: A different slant on professional development. *Learning and Leading with Technology, 26*(7), 4-5.

Naidu, S. (1997). Collaborative reflective practice: An institutional design architecture for the internet. *Distance Education, 18*, 257-283.

Nash, J. (1994). Integrating technology into educational organizations: The role of human resource development. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 376 569)

Office of Academic and Physical Support Services and Vocational Technology. (1996). *Saddleback College 1996-1997 governance manual.* Mission Viejo, CA: Saddleback College.

Ornstein, A., & Hunkins, F. (1993). *Curriculum: Foundations, principles, and theory* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Parker, D. (1996). *Integrating faculty use of technology in teaching and teacher education.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Tuscaloosa, AL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 406 341)

Poole, J. J., & Morgan, C. (1998, December). Schools have their computers, now what? *T.H.E. Journal, 26*(5), 60-61.

Privateer, P. M. (1999, January/February). Academic technology and the future of higher education: Strategic paths taken and not taken. *The Journal of Higher Education, 70*(1), 60-79.

Raschic, M., Maypole, D. E., & Day, P. A. (1998, Winter). Improving field education through Kolb learning theory. *Journal of Social Work Education, 34*(1), 31-42.

Rodes, P., Knapczyk, D., Chapman, C., & Chung, H. (2000, May). Involving teachers in web-based professional development. *T.H.E. Journal, 27*(10), 94-97.

Ross, J. L., & Schulz, R. A. (1999, Fall). using the world wide web to accommodate diverse learning styles. *College Teaching, 47*(4), 123-129.

Richardson, J. (1996). *Teacher to teacher. Inquiring minds: Creating a nation of teachers and learners. An education week special report,* 18-23. Washington, DC: Editorial Projects in Education, Inc. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 402 269)

Robbins, C. M. (1999). Reinventing the telecourse. *Distance Education Report, 2*(5), 1,4:

Rowntree, D. (1998 June). Assessing the quality of materials-based teaching and learning. *Open Learning*, pp. 12-21.

Rubel, S. K. (2002). *Accessibility and the law*. Retrieved April 2, 2002, from http://www.saundrakaerubel.com/accessibility_law.htm.

Saddleback College Public Information Office. *This is Saddleback College*. Mission Viejo, CA: Saddleback College.

Schwandt, L. (1996). An investigation of the organizational factors that foster academic vitality, commitment, and innovation among two-year college occupational faculty. Paper presented in The Olympics of Leadership: Overcoming Obstacles, Balancing Skills, Taking Risks. Proceedings of the annual international conference of the National Community College Chair Academy. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 394 578)

Schoenfeld-Tacher, R., & Persichitte, K. A. (2000, July 1). Differential skills and competencies required of faculty teaching distance education courses. *International Journal of Educational Technology, 2*(1). Retrieved December 13, 2001, from http://www.outreach.uiuc.edu/ijet/v2n1/v2n1articles.html.

SchWeber, C., Kelley, K., & Orr, G. (1998). *Training, and retaining, faculty for online courses: Challenges and strategies.* Report in Distance Learning '98. Proceedings of the annual conference on Distance Teaching & Learning, 14th, Madison, WI. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 422 874)

Smith, S. J. (2000, Spring). Graduate students mentors for technology success. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 23*(2), 167-182.

Strong, R., & Harmon, E. G. (1997). Online graduate degrees: A review of three internet-based master's degree offerings. *The American Journal of Distance Education, 11*(3), 58-70.

Summerville, J. (1999, July 11). Role of awareness of cognitive style in hypermedia. *International Journal of Educational Technology, 1*(1). Retrieved December 13, 2001, from http://www.outreach.uiuc.edu/ijet/v1n1/summerville/index.html.

Thatcher, J. W. (2001). *Accessibility is a serious issue.* Retrieved February 2, 2002, from http://www.jimthatcher.com.

U.S. Copyright Office. (1999). *The Digital Millennium Copyright Act of 1998.* Washington, DC: Author.

U. S. Department of Education. (1996). *Building bridges: The mission & principles of professional development.* Washington, DC: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 404 322)

Van Tassell, F. (1999, Summer). Policy impact of professional development schools when faculty and administrator views conflict regarding the university reward system. *Action in Teacher Education, 21*(3), 1-7.

West, G. P. (1999, Summer). Teaching and technology in higher education: Changes and challenges. *Adult Learning, 10*(4), 16-18.

West, P. (1996). *A virtual network. Inquiring minds: Creating a nation of teachers and learners. An education week special report* (pp. 24-27). Washington, DC: Editorial Projects in Education, Inc. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 402 269)

Whitehead, B. (2000, November). How does technology measure up? *Principal, 80*(2), 45-46.

Williams, E., Gold, V., & Russell, S. (1994). *Training teachers to plan staff development programs for rural schools.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Chicago, IL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 367 607)

Zeidler, D., & LeBaron, J. (1997). *Meeting the challenge of professional development: Design and evaluation of a telecommunications mediated course in science, mathematics, and technology education.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, 70th, Oak Brook, IL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 405 209).

APPENDIXES

Appendix A

Formative Committee Members

The members of the formative committee represent groups that have an interest in the professional development of faculty regarding online courses. The following were members of the formative committee:

Kathleen Constance: Application Specialist II, ITC at Saddleback College.

Tricia Evans, Dean: Business Science, Vocational Education, and Economic Development at Saddleback College.

James Gaston: Applications Project Manager at South Orange County Community College District.

Appendix B

Summative Committee Members

The summative committee members were chosen from California colleges. They were chosen for their experience and expertise working with online education. All three of the committee members produce online courses. Scott Finn has won an Online Model Course Grant from the California Virtual Campus. Dr. Barbara Gonzalez trains teachers to use WebCT and Blackboard™. The following were members of the summative committee:

Betty Disney: Online Education Coordinator & Instructor, Art History, Cypress College.

Scott Finn: Counselor, Counseling and Personal Development, Southwestern College.

Dr. Barbara Gonzalez: Assistant Professor Chemistry Education, California State University Fullerton.

Appendix C

Letter of Introduction to California Community Colleges

Contact Name
Institution Name
Street Address
City, CA, zip

Dear Blackboard™ User

My name is Anne Marie Schar and I am a doctoral student at Nova Southeastern University engaged in research for the purpose of fulfilling the requirement for the Doctor of Education Degree. My research seeks to create a program to support the development of online courses at Saddleback College in Mission Viejo, CA. The program is intended to provide training for faculty who are creating online courses. I am writing to you to request your assistance by providing information about the utilization of technology for instruction at your college. After the information you provide is reviewed, I would like to conduct some follow-up interviews via telephone.

A stamped and addressed envelope is enclosed for your use in returning the survey. I will provide a summary of the findings of the study if you will mark the appropriate section of the survey. If you have questions or would like to discuss the project, please feel free to contact me or my research advisor (see information below).

Investigator
Anne Marie Schar
1705 Ford Ave.
Redondo Beach, CA 90278
(310) 937-6162
anne@bmhs.com

Advisor
Dr. K. Varcoe
882 W. Aaron Drive
State College, PA 16803
(814) 237-9144
Fax (814) 867-4702

Appendix D

Survey Instrument for California Community Colleges

Thank you for taking the time to complete the following survey. Please answer the questions to the best of your knowledge. If a question does not apply to your institution, please write NA next to the question. Please add any comments or suggestions that you believe may be pertinent to the study at the bottom or on the back of this sheet.

Name ____

Position at institution ______________________________

Name of Institution ______________________________

Does your institution currently have online courses available?

Yes No

Please estimate the percentage of the departments at your institution that offer online courses.

____

Does your institution offer online degree/certificate programs?

Yes No

For how long has the faculty at your institution been using Blackboard™?

1 year or less 2 years 3 years+

What type of Blackboard™ training did your institution implement for the faculty?

Internal (i.e. institutional faculty or staff) External (i.e. trainers from Blackboard™)

Both

Did your institution create a formal professional development program to aid the faculty in creating/modifying courses designed to be online?

Yes No

What are/were the desired outcomes of your institution's professional development program? (Circle all that apply)

More effective courses Blackboard™ Mastery Other

Please circle the components of professional development that are included in the professional development training. (Circle all that apply)

Mentoring Workshops Online Tutorials Evaluation

Please estimate the percent of your faculty that were involved in the training. ____________

How is your training implemented (circle all that apply)?

Individual Departmental Voluntary Mandatory

Were the faculty involved in training compensated for their time?

Yes No

Thank you for taking the time to complete the survey. Would you like to have a copy of the summary of this research project?

Yes No

Appendix E

Follow-Up Interview Instrument for California Community Colleges

In the following survey questions that have been answered on the survey are typed in italics. These questions are listed for the information of the interviewer.

I. Institutional Information

Name

Name of Institution

Position in institution

Does your institution currently have online courses available?

Do all of your institution's departments offer online courses?

If not, which ones do?

How & why were those departments or courses chosen?

Does your institution offer online degree programs or certificates?

If yes, for which programs?

Has your institution encountered any difficulties in using Blackboard™?

Technical: (i.e. server or website stability)

Pedagogical: (i.e. student evaluation, cheating)

Other: (faculty resistance, etc.)

II. Professional Development Information

Did members of your faculty utilize outside resources for professional training in creating online courses (i.e. UCLA classes etc.)?

Were faculty who already had online course development training used to train others?

How was the professional development program presented to the faculty? (How was it implemented?)

As one entire body
Through departments
Signing up through the institution

Was the professional development program mandatory?

If yes, for whom was it mandatory?

The entire faculty
The faculty currently involved in creating Blackboard™ courses
Other

If no, how were faculty involved?

voluntary sign-up
departmental recommendations

What components did your institution include in its program?

Workshops, Mentoring, Evaluation, Online, Other

Would the institution/Does the institution plan to include any components that it does not currently have in its program in the future?

What [components] would your institution omit from its program?

What is the status of the institution's professional development program:

Ongoing
Completed

How was your professional development program evaluated? (How was it deemed successful or unsuccessful? Questionnaires? # of instructors teaching online? evaluation of courses online by committee?)

Mentor Program Questions:

The first question will be asked IF mentoring is not listed as a component of the professional development of an institutions program. If mentoring is listed all of the questions will be asked of the interviewee.

Was informal mentoring between faculty members anticipated and/or noted when designing the professional development or when observing training? (ADD?)

How were mentors chosen:

Was an application form used?

What characteristics distinguished those chosen to be mentors?

Were Mentors offered compensation?

Monetary
Time
Other

Did mentors attend training?

How much time was spent in mentor training?

How often did mentors meet with each other as a group prior to beginning the program?

How often did mentors meet with each other as a group after beginning the program?

How many mentees were assigned to mentors?

One mentee to one mentor
2-6 mentees to one mentor
Groups of _______ to one mentor

How were mentoring groups assigned?

Within departments
Physical location (same building)
Choose for themselves
Random assignment

How often did mentors meet with mentees?

What was the quality of the relationship?

(How) Were mentoring hours tracked?

Was there an evaluation of the mentoring program?

What mentoring activities were considered to be most beneficial to the mentee?

What benefits of the mentoring were considered most beneficial to the mentor?

Would your institution conduct other mentoring programs in this way?

What aspects of the program did the institution find most beneficial?

What aspects of the program were found to be the least beneficial?

What aspects of the program would be changed, if possible?

What are some recommendations for future mentoring programs?

Workshop Questions

Who taught the workshops?

Internal faculty/staff

Who?

How were they chosen?

External company

Which?

How was it chosen?

How were the professional development workshop/programs funded?

How were the workshop leaders compensated?

Part of their current position
Stipend
Raise
Promotion
Considered part of service to the institutional community
Other

How were workshop attendees compensated for their time?

Part of their current position
Stipend
Raise
Promotion
Considered part of service to the institutional community
Other

How were workshop sign-ups handled (circle all that apply):

Per workshop
Series of workshops
First-come-first-served
Based on need
Through departments

How many workshops were offered?

What workshops did your institution include in your program?

Did the training include broader concepts for online class instruction? (i.e. legal issues of copyright, cheating, evaluation online, etc.)

Yes
No
What topics were included? (see above)

What materials did your institution use for the Blackboard™ training?

From Blackboard™
Institutionally designed

How often was each workshop given?

What was the duration of each workshop?

Were workshops hands-on? (conducted in-front of computers using the program and inputting material.)

If the workshops were hands-on, where did they take place?

Computer lab on campus
Set up computers on campus
Worked with an outside company at an off-campus location

Were participants divided into computer competency levels?

Were non-computer literate faculty offered separate computer courses?

Online Training

Was online training/tutorials offered to the faculty?

If yes, was online training for individuals or groups?

If yes, who designed the online training materials?

If yes, how did faculty access the online training?

Effectiveness of Programs and Training

What was the most effective part of training for your institution?

What was the least effective part of training for your institution?

If it were in your power, what would you change about the training process?

General Comments or suggestions

Appendix F

The Criteria for the Research Study

For the program itself

Question 1: program criteria based on interviews and review of literature

- Content: Blackboard™ basics
    - Basic features & navigation
    - Communication
    - knowledge of limitations of student equipment
        - (i.e. 56k modems, Mac vs PC, downloads necessary)
    - Other content
        - Alternative teaching methods to enhance computer usage
        - Basic issues addressed: legal, learning styles w/ideas
            - (ADA under legal incl. www.cvc3.org)
    - Activities used
        - Review what works
        - Decide what cannot be duplicated & how objectives can be reached
- Easy in & out
- Introductory material

Question 2: program implementation based on interviews and review of literature

- Blend into current programming (not separate)
- Minimal funding—importance of funding for faculty mentors
- Flex-day credits
- Program flexible enough to be distributed into shorter or longer time periods
    When needed
- Mentor paid w/recommendations for compensation

Question 3: program assessment based on interviews and review of literature

- One person who gathers & follows-up on assessment
- Online
- On-going
- Dissemination for follow-up

Appendix G

Saddleback College Blackboard™ and Online Course Program

Saddleback College Blackboard™ and Online Course Program
Anne Marie Schar
Copyright May, 2002

The following document is the completed program to support the creation of online courses by the ITC at Saddleback College. Inherent to the program are the three products that the study was designed to create: the program, the implementation, and program assessment.

The program contains a series of workshops, online tutorials, discussion thread, and a mentor program that work together to create information and support for Saddleback College faculty who are creating online courses. This is the plan for supporting the faculty via professional development training.

The plan for implementation is much simpler. Based on the literature review of model programs, surveys, and interviews with California community colleges the implementation is to have the program workshops offered as part of the ongoing ITC offerings. The new workshops will be offered as would any other workshop for ITC at Saddleback College.

The plan for assessment is also straightforward. Currently ITC has an evaluation at the conclusion of workshops. This evaluation would be conducted at the end of each of the Program workshops. The data will be collected and changes to the program made based on the input of participants. Data will also be collected using the student evaluations of online courses. Saddleback College is currently devising an evaluation specifically for the online courses. The information gathered from these student evaluations will be made available to the ITC Blackboard™ program coordinator for the purposes of formative program evaluation. The Discussion Thread and mentor programs are also designed to provide feedback and further needs assessment for the program.

The third workshop will be Using the Computer to Advantage (BBIII): The objective will be to learn how computer technology can be used to effectively meet the needs of a diverse student body who have a variety of learning styles. The Learning Styles Tutorial (LST) will be used to introduce ideas and/or refresh knowledge of common student and instructor learning styles and how these different styles can be easily accommodated in the online classroom. The workshop will lead the faculty through a series of activities and allow them to reformat activities/assignments to be part of their online classes. The majority of the workshop will entail faculty working on computers with several group brainstorming/critiquing sessions included. The workshop should have no more than 15 attendees. There should be one mentor/leader and 1-2 mentors available to help those who need/desire one-on-one support during the session.

A final workshop will be offered by the ITC staff mentor. This will not be a flex-day workshop, but will be strictly voluntary and act as support for faculty creating courses online. Faculty chairpersons may recommend that faculty attend for remediation purposes. The final workshop will be Blackboard™ Review (BR) for faculty who have attended prior workshops but are still not comfortable using the Blackboard™ program or who have questions regarding their Blackboard™ site. This workshop will be offered one time per month to take place during scheduled mentor office hours. Faculty attending workshops should email a list of questions, concerns, needs prior to the workshop so that the mentors can prepare to meet the more specialized needs of this group of faculty.

How Do I Get Started Tutorial (HDI)

The HDI tutorial will be online and accessible for all Saddleback College Faculty. The objective of the tutorial is to help those beginning to approach online teaching by providing simple steps to prepare for online classes. The online tutorial will consist of steps for gathering materials and information, materials that will help make the most of the in-person flex day workshops, and where to find information online. The tutorial will also include examples of materials that will be helpful.

The HDI tutorial will be recommended for all instructors considering online courses. It will be required as part of the flex-day credit. The tutorial will count as ½ hour of the flex-day credit. With the tutorial prep, faculty should be better prepared for the workshop and it will be a more meaningful/useful experience.

The ITC staff will monitor which faculty members did access the site prior to the workshop. Alternately, a time can be set aside for the faculty to come and use the online tutorial in the ITC center prior to the workshop. Faculty may feel more comfortable with the opportunity to ask questions while preparing for the workshop.

Basics Online Tutorial (BOT)

The BOT is designed to be used in conjunction with the Blackboard™ flex-day workshops. There is a copy of basic computer terms that the faculty may need to familiarize themselves with as well as basic Blackboard™ information. There are two activities that will aid those faculty who have limited computer experience to familiarize themselves with the computer and windows environment for the purpose of creating their course (it is not highly technical—the objective is ease of use and ability to work with a new tool with limited experience.) This allows the faculty to be introduced to some Blackboard™ basics working at their own pace. The faculty will access the tutorial while in the ITC lab with ITC staff mentors and faculty mentors available to help answer questions.

The BOT has a list of computer terms defined. It also has an access sheet in FAQ (Frequently Asked Questions) format to answer basic setup questions. The BOT has links to the Blackboard™ online interactive tutorials. It also includes reading/access sheets which provide a more simplified version of the instructions and where and how a classroom can be set up. There are a list of suggestions for working with Blackboard™ .

This should take approximately 1 hour to work through when utilizing the online tutorials. The tutorials will be accessed by the workshop leader using and LCD overhead. The leader can more fully explain different sections of the Blackboard™ site. Faculty will follow the interactive tutorial with the leader and ask questions as the lessons are completed.

Faculty with extensive computer experience should be separated from those with less experience. They should be encouraged to do the tutorials at their own pace so as not to be bored by a slower-paced class.

Legal Issues Tutorial (LIT)

The Legal Issues Tutorial (LIT) is designed to help faculty understand copyright issues that may be associated with online course teaching and to provide helpful information to help them create a course that does not infringe on the rights of others. The copyright issue has become more important for institutions as well as individuals and it is important that individuals be informed of their rights and responsibilities regarding this matter.

The LIT should be mandatory for all faculty creating online courses. The online tutorial could be run at the end or beginning of a Flex-day session so that faculty can ask more questions or have help from mentors accessing documents and web sites.

The tutorial consists of a quiz and readings. The quiz will direct faculty to further readings to enhance their knowledge of the legal issues involved. It also includes links to web sites that have similar question and answer sections and information explained in lay-terms.

The Learning Styles Tutorial (LST)

The LST is a very brief online tutorial. The purpose of LST is to act as a refresher for Saddleback College faculty regarding different student learning styles and also act as a refresher for the different varieties of teaching styles.

The tutorial offers a brief quiz. Each answer, right or wrong, offers an article that discusses an aspect of learning styles and how to work to create an online course that meets the needs of a variety of styles.

The readings added to the tutorial are meant as references. They include a broad range of learning and teaching styles briefly defined. The articles are both theoretical and practical, some including concrete ideas for online courses to meet the needs of specific types of learners.

The LST is for use by the Saddleback College faculty without an instructor or mentor. The LST tutorial will encourage faculty with specific questions to seek out mentors via email, telephone, or physical office location during office hours. The location of the Blackboard™ Discussion Thread will also be available as a link for the faculty to access.

Blackboard™ Discussion Thread (BDT)

The Saddleback College Faculty may need an open forum for discussing issues relating to creating and maintaining online courses at Saddleback College. The Blackboard™ Discussion Thread should be set up on the ITC course site that includes the other Blackboard™ tutorials/online workshops. All faculty should have access to the Blackboard™ discussion thread. The purpose of the Blackboard™ Discussion Thread is multiple: to provide answers to technical and pedagogical questions, to allow faculty to air frustrations or grievances, and to encourage professional growth through sharing ideas. The mentors role is to facilitate these purposes. The BDT will be introduced at all workshops and linked on all Blackboard™ tutorials.

The BDT will enable Saddleback College Faculty to create their own discussion threads regarding issues that they have or they may follow the threads regarding questions similar to their own. Faculty will also be able to answer questions or add comments to any discussion thread. This sort of informal mentoring should be encouraged.

The BDT will be monitored by the ITC staff mentors as well as the Faculty mentors. Each mentor should check the BDT board each day. Comments as well as questions should be immediately addressed.

If a mentor has no answer for a query he/she should bring this to the attention of other mentors. He/She could also provide optional resources for ferreting out answers (i.e. the Blackboard™ web site.)

Mentors should begin discussion threads on the BDT also. Mentors should address new theories in online teaching that may interest Saddleback College Faculty members. Mentors may also add threads answering questions that have been presented in one-on-one questions or during workshops. Mentors also could begin threads to encourage faculty to brainstorm online classroom activities, etc.

Mentor Program

What types of Mentors are needed?

A mentor is defined as one who advises others and gives them the benefit of his/her experience. There are two types of mentors for Saddleback College online faculty.

1. Technology Mentors
2. Course Mentors

The ITC staff at Saddleback College will, as part of their current positions, act as technology mentors to the Saddleback College Faculty. They do this currently, acting as workshop leaders, and also one-on-one as needed. These mentors should be responsible for assisting faculty in navigating the Blackboard™ program and aiding them in inputting, uploading, and designing the course sites.

Course mentors can be successfully derived from the Saddleback College faculty who are experienced Blackboard™ users. The course mentors can aid not only site creation but are also able to give first hand experience as to dealing with actual students online. The novice online Faculty can utilize experiences of knowledgeable faculty members to gather ideas and request advice.

Both mentors should not only be available to meet with novice faculty one-on-one or in small groups as requested, but also should be responsible for monitoring the Blackboard™ Workshop Question Thread discussion (Please see *Blackboard™ Discussion Thread* p.3)

All mentors will communicate regularly with the ITC staff member who is designated the Blackboard™ project coordinator. The Blackboard™ project coordinator will be on of the ITC technology mentors and a workshop leader.

Who should be a mentor?

The ITC staff has an excellent staff. In the interest of creating the most convenient and best support for the Saddleback College faculty the staff should assign three staff members to work with the faculty on a regular basis. These three should currently be leading Blackboard™ workshops and are the workshop leaders referred to in the outlined program.

The faculty member mentors should be volunteers recommended by department chairs and/or ITC staff who have been working with the faculty on the Blackboard™ project already. The faculty members should have at least 1 full year of experience with an online course and an interest in working with other faculty members. There should be at least five different faculty members from various departments.

How mentors can be measured

The ITC staff will calendar one-on-one sessions and these can be used to create a needs assessment for online faculty and help the ITC better meet the technology needs of the Saddleback College faculty who are creating online courses. The ITC staff will monitor the Blackboard™ Workshop Question Threads. ITC staff will primarily be responsible for replying to any questions regarding the Blackboard™ software usage. However, being familiar with Blackboard™ and with multiple course sites they may also suggest resources to answer pedagogical questions or to give successful pedagogical examples. The calendars and any pertinent discussion will be written out and emailed to the designated ITC staff member.

The faculty mentors will have set hours designated to mentoring. They will act as support to the ITC staff during Blackboard™ Workshops and may lead workshops if they feel comfortable doing so. They will actively follow-up with novice course designers after a workshop. The mentors will note the follow-up time and date and any discussion that would reflect on better providing information and instruction during the workshops. This will be emailed to the designated ITC staff.

Both faculty and staff mentors would be reviewed per the Saddleback College professional review system by their supervisors. Faculty and staff supervisors would request information regarding mentor hours calendared, hours on Blackboard™ Workshop Question Thread, in person workshops and one-on-one mentoring. ITC staff mentors and Faculty mentors will be listed on all Blackboard™ tutorial web sites with email, office telephone number, and office location with office hours posted.

Compensation for mentors.

It is not uncommon for a college's technology staff to mentor the faculty as part of their support positions. While the mentoring services from this group are invaluable this should still be considered part of their workload and the mentoring should be divided equitably as any project for this group. No additional funding is necessary.

While it is understood that many faculty are willing to devote their own time to mentoring colleagues, a mentor program can be time consuming. To enable faculty to consistently have time for their colleagues it is essential to offer compensation. There are several options that should be considered for compensating the mentor faculty. The mentoring could be added into the faculty workload as fulfillment of flex hours or the equivalent of teaching one two-credit course. Faculty would be responsible for fulfilling commensurate time to equal the above. Another option is that stipend could be offered to the faculty member to compensate for time spent mentoring other faculty. A third option is that the faculty member could receive professional advancement credit.

Checklist for mentors
Calendar: note hours
Check discussion thread 1x per day
Follow-up telephone communications
Check online course sites of instructors who have requested it
Set up meetings with departments/groups/individuals with questions

How to provide feedback
via email:
    send ideas with concrete suggestions
    answer questions directly
    if you don't know the answer provide another expert contact

Options for providing feedback
Telephone
Email
Snail mail
In person
    at department request

Role of the mentor includes
Providing Feedback to faculty
Providing practical suggestions to faculty
Providing resources to faculty

Formal Sessions
Workshops
Scheduled one-on-one time (if desired by faculty)
Scheduled time in departments (if desired by faculty)
BDT—check regularly

Log these hours and turn-in to Mentor Leader

Informal Sessions
Approached during office hours
Log these hours and turn-in to Mentor Leader

Resources:
Blackboard™ web site
Other mentors
Sample web sites (Kathleen's Templates)

Program Assessment

There is a need to have ongoing assessment for the program to support online course development so that the ITC can determine that it is meeting the needs of the faculty desiring to create online courses. Ongoing assessment will also help the ITC determine any further needs that the faculty who are developing online courses might have. At the end of each workshop a standard ITC survey will be given to gather information regarding the information provided at the current workshop and what further information would be desired. The ITC mentor will review all surveys and make appropriate recommendations for further program training based on these surveys. Each online tutorial will also contain a brief survey regarding the information provided and further information desired on each topic.

A second assessment component is the course evaluations of actual online courses. Evaluations of courses that were designed by workshop and tutorial participants will be gathered by the ITC Blackboard™ project coordinator. After the evaluations are completed by the students an aggregate copy of the evaluations for each course will be forwarded to the ITC to aid in formative professional development assessment of the program to support the faculty in creating online courses.

Basic Blackboard™ Introduction Workshop

Objective:

This workshop will teach the basic steps in creating an online course using Blackboard™. It will introduce the different parts of Blackboard™ through tutorials online as well as actual practice inputting students, uploading course documents, and creating assessments for courses using digitally formatted documents.

Materials Needed:

- Hard Copies of Course Materials as outlined in HDI
- Computer
- Internet Access
- Note taking materials (if desired)
- LCD projector
- The Most Basics of Basics

Workshop Leader:

Prior to the workshop:

- Send copies of The Most Basics of Basics
- Go onto the HDI tutorial and verify which faculty have accessed the tutorial.
- Be certain that each faculty member has a course site with user name, password, and 'students' (other workshop participants) assigned (students will be loaded by the instructor in activity 4)
- Be certain that each faculty member is enrolled as a "student" in the Workshop leader's online course
- Send each faculty member the "basic of basics" information guide
- Set up LCD projector for Activity 4
- Set up a basic question on the discussion thread that each faculty member will have access to

Workshop Agenda:

1. Verify faculty who are at the workshop
2. Stratification: faculty who have a high comfort level working with computers vs. those with a low comfort level—this will be based on their own opinion. Once seated faculty should log onto computer as themselves.
3. Verify that faculty have brought HDI materials and/or have access to the materials on their server folders.
4. State workshop objective
5. Begin with Activity 1: Computer Terms Defined (this should take 5-10 minutes to complete)
6. Continue with Activity 2: Online Tutorials from Blackboard™ (this should take approximately 1 hour). Answer any questions that faculty have as they participate in the interactive tutorial.
7. Brief break as faculty complete tutorials

8. Continue with Activity 3: Where Can I Find Stuff? (this should take approximately ½ hour to review the buttons etc. (Blackboard™ Instructor's Manual, pp. 19-21)
9. Open up assigned course site.
10. Activity 4: Loading students and documents (Blackboard™ Instructor's Manual, pp. 74-79 and pp. 34-46)
11. Activity 5: Assessment (Blackboard™ Instructor's Manual, pp. 48-60)
12. Activity 6: Legal Issues Tutorial (if short on time this may done after the workshop as an independent tutorial—the workshop leader will be responsible for encouraging faculty to complete it and for determining that faculty participants have indeed finished.
13. Activity 7: Equipment: hardware and software needs
14. Last 5 minutes: using LCD put up the sites of other Blackboard™ tutorials, mentor emails, etc. and review the discussion thread site where faculty can leave questions.
15. Have faculty fill-out workshop evaluation on the workshop course site

How Do I Get Started Tutorial

Objective:

The objective of this tutorial is to prepare faculty who are taking the Blackboard™ Flex-Day Workshops. To enhance the effectiveness of the workshops faculty can bring materials to make the workshop more meaningful for each individual instructor. This tutorial will help faculty to gather appropriate materials and format them so that they may create an actual online course as part of the workshop. This tutorial should be loaded onto its own course site and instructors given access prior to the workshop.

Loaded onto announcement portion of the site will be a link to the ITC workshop offerings that train faculty in computer skills highlighting the dates available prior to the Blackboard™ workshops (should they care to brush up on computer skills).

Directions:

- Each of the activities for this tutorial will help faculty to prepare materials for their online courses.
- Faculty should read the instructions for each activity and follow the directions.
- All activities should be completed on the computer.
- Documents such as Course Goals & Objectives and Syllabus should be created in word. Activities that include lists may be created in either Word or Excel. The format style is up to the instructor.
- Activities should be saved in the faculty member's server folder AND a hard copy should be available.

What you will need:

The following is a list of course materials that you should have available for use with this tutorial. You may not need all of these items, however, the more items available, the more effective the tutorial will be.

Course Objectives
Course Goals
Course Syllabus
Tests
Quizzes
Assignments
Readings
Calendar
Lecture Notes

Many faculty have course materials in *digital format* already. You will need your information in digital format to *upload* onto the course site.

Activity 1: Digital Format

URL link to online course site example

For working with the online course it is simplest if all of your materials are in digital format. Possibly you already have all of the information typed into Word or on Excel. The course objectives and goals will be posted on the course site as well as all of the assignments, readings, etc.

A. Type in any documents that are not already in digital format. Keep a copy in your server folder as well as a copy on your local folder. This way you have a backup copy.
B. Type out any assignments or handouts to prepare to upload onto your course site that are not currently in digital format.
C. Do you use outside readings?
    *Are the readings available online via the library or another accessible online library?
    *Where can your students find these readings online?

ALTERNATIVE to typing documents:

For Activity 1 parts A & B typing is suggested for entering documents into digital format. The documents may also be *scanned* into digital files if a scanner is available. With scanning a document please remember that OCR is essential if you plan on editing documents and that you MUST review documents scanned in OCR for common errors based on misunderstood symbols (i.e. the letter B may scan as D).

Activity 2: Assignments & Activities

URL link to online course site example

Review the assignments and activities that you have for your course. Will these assignments be as effective in the online class as they are in the traditional classroom? Since the bulk of the online course is online, it is essential that assignment objectives, directions, assessment, and due dates be clear.

Questions:
    Are the assignments'/activities' directions clear?
    Is the objective of the assignments/activities explained?
    Are the assignments/activities able to be completed via an online format? (in writing?)
    Are groups given enough background to work via email or using online chat to work together?
    Are the assessment criteria clearly explained?
    Are the due dates and time limits clear?
    Is the end product (narrative paper, outline, list, summary) that is to be turned in clearly defined?

For each assignment or activity that does not include complete directions, etc. add a section including the clarifications.

Activity 3: Activities & Assignments not conducive to online courses

URL link to online course site example

Create a list of the individual activities and assignments that you currently use in this class that you are uncertain of using online for example: Oral presentations, debates, in-class group projects that you currently use.

A. Brainstorm ideas on how to convert the assignment's/activity's objective(s) into an effective online assignment/activity.
    i.e. in-class debate: objective: critical thinking, research, presentation

    Use discussion thread:
        Student A makes opening statement
            3-5 lines + citations
        Student B makes opening statement
            3-5 lines + citations
        Student A has 10 line to outline argument
            with citations
        Student B has same
        Student A has closing argument
        Student B has closing argument

    Other students can be assigned to either assist the two debaters or they could have a separate discussion thread to critique the debaters arguments. This not only allows the debate objective of critical thinking, research and presentation, but also allows the other students to actively participate in the debate.

B. Print a hard copy of the list. Bring this list to the Blackboard Flex-day workshops.

Activity 4: The Lecture

URL link to online course site example

The in-class lecture is possible in an online format.

A. Create a list of all of the lectures for the course that you are modifying.
    List the learning objective for each lecture.

B. Answer the questions pertaining to the lecture notes:
    Are the lectures in digital format?
    If not, can they be easily converted to digital format? (i.e. if the notes are typed they can easily be scanned)

Are you interested in lecturing online or would you consider alternative methods to meeting the learning objectives?

The Most Basics of Basics

How to turn on your computer:

PC models and Macintosh models

1. Push in the power button on the CPU (This is a physical button on the computer)
2. Push in the on button on the monitor
3. Be certain to turn-on your speakers (if using sound)

Your computer should turn on. It will take a few minutes for the Operating system (Win98, WinNT, XP, Win2000) to load. Please do not get impatient and begin to press buttons—this may cause the system to malfunction or, in extreme cases, crash.

How to turn off your computer

PC models

1. Locate the START button at the bottom of the computer screen.
2. Left click on the START
3. Choose the "Shut Down" option
4. There will be a gray screen, it will give you choices such as, "What do you really want the computer to do?" *Log Off* *Shut Down* *Restart*
5. Make the appropriate choice—SHUT DOWN—and click 'o.k.' or 'yes'

Macintosh models (there are no Macs on Saddleback College campus—however, if you need to know…)

1. Locate the SPECIAL drop down menu at the top of the screen
2. Click on it and choose *Shut Down*

Turning the computer off using the power button can cause problems with your computer. It is best to utilize the START button to close down.

If you have any difficulties please ask the ITC staff for assistance.

How to Log On

When using a computer in a network environment it is essential to log onto the network as well as log off. This keeps your documents secure and private. Logging Onto the domain (network) allows you to access folders, files, and documents, as well as printing from common printers.

The ITC will assign you a username and an initial password. You will change your password the 1st time that you log on.

Type your username into the field available for it.
Type your password into the password field

The first time you log on the computer will ask you to choose another password
You will type it twice—exactly the same way.

How to Log Off

When using computers in a lab or a shared computer you may choose to log off rather than to shut down the computer if others may be using it after you.

1. Locate the START button at the bottom of the computer screen.
2. Left click on the START
3. Choose the "Log Off" option
4. There will be a gray screen, it will give you choices such as, "What do you really want the computer to do?" *Log Off* *Shut Down* *Restart*
5. Make the appropriate choice—Log Off—and click 'o.k.' or 'yes'

Basics Online Tutorial Activities

Objective:

The objective of this workshop is to help the faculty to understand the basics of using the Blackboard™ program and to be able to utilize the control panel to set up an online course.

Materials Needed:

Computer
Internet Access

Activity 1: Basic Computer Terms

Workshop participants will follow assignment instructions accessing the Basic Computer Terms documents and then following the instructions below.

1. Log onto your computer account
2. Log onto the Blackboard™ web site that the workshop leader has set up
3. Click on *assignments*
4. Open the folder titled *Basic Computer Terms*
5. Follow the directions given for the Reading Assignment
6. Follow the directions given for the Writing Assignment
7. Ask the mentor/workshop leader for help if you need it.

Activity 2: Online Tutorials from Blackboard™

Open up the web browser.
Go to www.blackboard.com/tutorials

Working at your own pace go through the four instructor tutorials. Each tutorial will take approximately 15 minutes. The tutorials are interactive so you will need to read carefully and follow the directions.

The objective of doing the tutorials as part of the workshop is to allow you the guidance of mentors while following the tutorials. Please feel free to ask questions and ask for help when necessary.

Activity 3: Where Can I Find Stuff?

The workshop leader will lead this using an LCD projector. Those who are more comfortable should use this time to experiment with Blackboard™

Log Onto the Blackboard™ site that the ITC has set up for you.
Using the Where Can If Find Stuff FAQ sheet:
1. Read each FAQ.
2. Go to the section where the answer indicates each item can be found.

Activity 4: Entering Students and Uploading Documents

Entering Users into Blackboard™

After students have enrolled into your online class you will need to add them into your online course through Blackboard™ . Using the Saddleback College web site this will be very simple. The initial directions below are to get to your Blackboard™ site and will not be repeated.

To get to Blackboard™

1. Double Click on the web browser and open the Blackboard™ web site.
2. Log onto your Blackboard™ Site.
3. Click on the *Courses* tab.
4. Click on the Course for which you would like to enter students.
5. On the left hand side of the computer is a list of buttons
   Choose the *Control Panel* button

As you have learned by now, the Control Panel allows you to build and maintain your course site. Under this button you have a variety of areas to use. For inputting students you will use the *User Management* area.

1. Click on *Add Users*
2. Choose *Batch Create Users for Course*
3. The program gives excellent instructions in section one.
4. Go to 'step two' and Leave the delimiter set to automatic.
5. Click the *browse* button.
6. Follow the path to \\server\folder\file\students
7. Once you have the correct file name for your course click *submit*.

Uploading Documents

Documents to upload may include:

Item	**Best Location**
Syllabus	Course Information
Calendar or schedule	Course Information
Lecture notes	Course Documents
Handouts	Course Documents
Course assignments	Assignments
Course readings	Assignments or Course Documents
Supplemental readings	Course Documents or Assignments
Worksheets	Course Documents or Assignments
Tests, Quizzes, Essay Questions	Assignments or Assessments

Using the digital format of the syllabus that you've brought

1. Click on *Course Information*
2. Click on *add document*
3. From the drop down menu choose the item that you would like to submit and choose a color for your title.
4. In the section titled *Enter Information Below* type in any explanation for the document.
5. (Section 2) browse to the file that you want to attach (your syllabus)
6. Choose the *name of link to file* (this will tell students what type of file it is; i.e. MSWord)
7. Choose whether you want to *Create a link to the file* (the students will be redirected to another site for the document), *Display the file within the page* (the students will view the page on the site), or *Unpackage the files* (the file will unzip a zipped file, this is good for especially big files).
8. *Do you want this information available immediately?* This allows you the option of when students may access the document (choose yes for this exercise)
9. *Do you want to track this content's usage?* Choose yes if you want to determine the number of students actually accessing the document. This could help you determine if there are misunderstandings, etc. due to lack of student usage. (Choose No for this exercise)
10. *Do you want to add metadata?* This allows you to add further data to explain terms to the students (choose No for this exercise)
11. Do you want to add additional off-line content? For accessing CDROMs (Choose No for this exercise)
12. Click *submit*

Numbers 8-10 offer options that would be appropriate to more complex documents. For the purposes of this workshop they will not be used. Please experiment with the options and use the Discussion Links or work with a mentor if you have further questions.

Activity 5: Assessment

Readings

Dirks, M. (1997). Developing an appropriate assessment strategy: Research and guidance for practice. Paper presented at the NAU/web.97 conference, Flagstaff, AZ. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 423 274)

Dirks, M. (1998). How is assessment being done in distance learning? Paper presented at the NAU/web.98 conference, Flagstaff, AZ. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 423 273)

ERIC EVANS has critical thinking quiz vs memory recall quiz article that should be added to reading list

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This tutorial is designed to review test, quiz, and survey procedures using Blackboard™ 's online tools. Begin in the *Control Panel.*

1. Choose a short test or quiz
2. Click on Assessment Manager (under Assessment)
3. Choose *add a quiz/exam* or *add survey*
4. Fill in the open fields, *name, description*
5. Click *submit*
6. Fill in the open field, *instructions* (remember to be very clear)
7. Click *submit*
8. The drop-down menu offers a choice of *fill-in the blank, multiple choice, matching, multiple answer, ordering, short answer/essay, true/false, or from question pool or assessment*, choose one
9. Go through each style on question and input an assessment question, answer etc. Carefully follow the directions, if you need help ask.
10. Under the options for correct and incorrect feedback if a question style offers to let you put the question into a 'category' (i.e. matching) click the 'category' button (this option is not available for all question styles.)
11. Create a category and input the question (You will use this when choosing a question from the question pool or assessment). For each of the choices follow the directions given on the page, complete all of the fields. Instructors are given the option of inserting feedback to right or wrong student answers. This is at the instructor's discretion.
12. Click *submit*

After you've input all of your questions:

13. Review the test/quiz
14. Choose to make the item available immediately under the availability option
15. Place an additional announcement in the assignments folder (this will create a link)
16. Review the options for students taking the test—check the boxes that you would like included in the assessment.
17. Ask the mentors if you have any questions regarding the options

The assessment will be made available to the students through their *Assignments* button (or course documents per your choice) on the control panel when you choose for them to have access to it. The instructor sets when it will be available and when it will no longer be available. Be certain to let your students know the time constraints on the calendar and where you have located the assessment.

Activity 6: Legal Issues Tutorial

Legal Issues Tutorial (LIT)

The LIT should be loaded onto the workshop course site and faculty should access it as students through assignments. The folder should include the quiz, the readings, and the *external links* should include those listed below.

Legal issues regarding course ownership, ADA, and copyright law are often hot-button issues for faculty. The LIT is designed to clarify course ownership with links to legal precedents. Just as importantly, copyright for educational purposes is also covered. Copyright law and the liability to institutions is becoming important as more entities assert copyright and prosecute for illegal use of proprietary materials.

1. Log onto the workshop course site
2. Click on *assignments*
3. Choose *Legal Issues Tutorial*
4. Click *take quiz*
5. To look up information go to the *External Links* button for further information

Instructions: The LIT offers a brief quiz. Each answer, right or wrong, offers an article that discusses an aspect of copyright law and offers information on where to find further information.

LIT Quiz

[For use of the ITC the correct answers are in *italics*. Explanations for some questions are listed immediately after the question in *italics*. The explanations should be attached to the correct answer for the faculty.]

1. Copyright
   a. is a form of protection provided by state law and is implemented differently from state to state.
   b. is a form of protection provided by the laws of the United States (title 17, U.S. Code) to the authors of "original works of authorship," including literary, dramatic, musical, artistic, and certain other intellectual works.
   c. is a form of legal protection but is not punishable by state or federal law.
   d. is a law that is not applicable in an academic/educational environment.

2. Public Domain is
   a. works that are free to be used without permission
   b. works that are government owned
   c. works found on the internet
   d. works that don't have a little © next to the title

3. Fair Use is
   a. using anything that you want to—you're an instructor
   b. sharing works that are too expensive for your students to buy
   c. a legal term which rules how much copyrighted material may be used/shared without infringing
   d. all of the above

3. Educators are subject to different copyright laws than commercial users.
    a. *true*
    b. false

4. Who owns the online class?
    a. the instructor
    b. *the institution*
    c. no one
    d. Blackboard™

An online class is a work made for hire. This is standard in the business and academic worlds. Unless it is clearly stipulated in the faculty member's contract the course and materials are legally owned by the institution. For further information see The Copyright Website http://www.benedict.com

5. Why doesn't an instructor own his/her course?
    a. the institution has better attorneys.
    b. so that he/she won't sell important information to competitors.
    c. *it is "work for hire."*
    d. none of the above.

An online class is a work made for hire. This is standard in the business and academic worlds. Unless it is clearly stipulated in the faculty member's contract the course and materials are legally owned by the institution. For further information see The Copyright Website http://www.benedict.com

4. An instructor may put any type of material on the internet course that he/she wants.
    a. true
    b. *false*

Copyright law governs academic course sites as well as other materials. Please view the The Digital Millennium Copyright Act of 1998: U.S. Copyright Office Summary United States Copyright Office or *Ten Myths about Copyright http://www.templetons.com/brad/copymyths.html*

5. It is o.k. to link to other web sites.
    a. *true*
    b. false

While this is generally true, be certain to look for signs that the author of the web site does not want you to link.

7. It is legal to distribute electronic programs to students as long as the instructor has paid for a copy.
    a. true
    b. *false*

8. It is legal to distribute copyrighted materials in an electronic environment.
   - *a. true*
   - *b. false*

This question is both true and false. If the instructor has permission from the copyrightor he/she may distribute copies per the agreement. However, if he/she has no permission it is a violation of copyright.

9. An instructor can use _____________ percent of copyrighted material for a class without infringing on copyright.
   - a. 100%
   - *b. 10%*
   - c. 25%
   - d. 0%

10. All digital images (pictures & graphics) found on the internet are public domain.
    - a. true
    - *b. false*

While many pictures and graphics are public domain many are copyrighted. A good example of this is Disney. Many sites will note that the graphics and images are copyrighted but others will not. Double-check to be certain before using an image.

11. How do I get permission?
    - *a. contact the owner of the information*
    - b. contact the publisher
    - c. hire a service to get permission
    - d, don't worry, just use it anyway

The publisher may or may not hold copyright on materials but they often do. Begin by contacting the publisher. There are also services available that will get copyright permission for a fee such as: http://www.copyright.com

12. Could I be sued for using someone else's work (what about samples or quotes)
    - *a. yes*
    - b. no

12. Instructors for online classes never meet with students
    - a. true
    - *b. false*

It is standard for instructors to meet a minimum number of times with students in a face-to-face environment. This may include on-sites exams and office meetings.

14. Both state and federal law require distance education to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act.
    - *a. true*

b. false

Distance Education: Access Guidelines for Students with Disabilities
August 1999
http://www.htctu.fhda.edu/dlguidelines/final%20dl%20guidelines.htm

15. Because of ADA requirements instructors may not use web sites that are not ADA compliant ("uncontrolled web sites").
    a. true
    b. false

However, instructors are liable for making information from all sources available to students who cannot view or hear sites that are not accessible for them. Be aware of this and provide alternative media, information sources for student accessibility.

16. To meet ADA compliance when using "uncontrolled web sites an instructor could:
    a. ignore it—the institution cannot be held accountable for web sites that it does not control.
    b. send an assistant to work with the individual student.
    c. provide the information via alternative methods

Readings:

Work Made For Hire Under the 1976 Copyright Act
United States Copyright Office [get pdf]

The Digital Millennium Copyright Act of 1998: U.S. Copyright Office Summary
United States Copyright Office [get pdf]

"Copyright Reminder" memo

Condoleezza Rice, Provost (Stanford University, October 1998)

Colyer, A. (1997). Copyright law, the internet, and distance education. The American Journal of Distance Education, 11(3), 41-57.

U.S. Copyright Office. (1999). The Digital Millennium Copyright Act of 1998. Washington, DC: Author.

Web Sites

ICDRI: making 508 understandable and assistance to make online courses comply
http://www.icdri.org/section_508_resource_page.htm

California Community College Virtual Campus
www.cvc3.org

The Copyright Website (http://www.benedict.com)

This site simplifies definitions of fair use copyright and also explains "work for hire". The site has links to other sites that may be helpful.

University of Texas Copyright Course
(http://www.utsystem.edu/OGC/intellectualProperty/cprtindx.htm)

This course is online and requires no login. The site answers some excellent questions in a very understandable format. Please see the other UT link for further information.

University of Texas pages for off-campus answers to copyright questions
(http://www.utsystem.edu/OGC/IntellectualProperty/offsite.htm)

This site provides links to outside copyright resources arranged by topic. An excellent resource for instructors.

Ten Myths about Copyright (http://www.templetons.com/brad/copymyths.html)

Brad Templeton has clarified basic elements of fair use using materials off of the internet. Please note that his website allows linking to his site but only limited copies of his document may be printed.

Copyright Clearance Center (http://www.copyright.com)

This site can help the instructor get permission to use copyrighted materials for a fee. It is not a free service.

Harvard Law School

http://eon.law.harvard.edu/property/http://eon.law.harvard.edu/property

Alternate media for ADA compliance

There are many ways to produce materials and find alternative media to help faculty be ADA complaint. With the possibility of more stringent guidelines in the future as well as a sincere desire to work with students here are some web sites and strategies for alternative media.

California Community Colleges Resources and Mentors
Access to Information
http://www.accessresource.org/index.html

The above site is administered through the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges, Student Services and Special Programs Division. The site contains information regarding section 508 compliance (this is specifically for Santa Barbara City College, however it is applicable to other state institutions), a link called *Access to Technology*, which provides information regarding alternatives such as large print versions of pdf documents, closed caption audio media, etc. While much of this site is under construction there are excellent contact resources and good legal links.

California Community Colleges Guidelines for Producing Instructional and Other Printed Materials in Alternate Media for Persons with Disabilities April 2000.

http://www.htctu.fhda.edu/amguidelines/am33000.htm

This site contains the guidelines that California Community Colleges are expected to follow regarding instructional materials. This document refers to section 504 of the ADA which does not specifically address technology and digital media. This is good background and will help establish guidelines for online courses as well.

Distance Education: Access Guidelines for Students with Disabilities
August 1999

http://www.htctu.fhda.edu/dlguidelines/final%20dl%20guidelines.htm

This site contains the guidelines that California Community Colleges are expected to follow regarding section 504 of the ADA and distance education. It clearly outlines the legal requirements and basic requirements for providing access. The Appendixes provide information regarding different types of alternative media.

The University of Washington: The Faculty Room

http://www.washington.edu/doit/Faculty/Rights/Resources/

The University of Washington site is designed to inform its faculty of ADA guidelines and providing resources to help them to create accessible courses. This site has extensive links and is a good place to browse for answers to questions that faculty might have.

Government Sites

http://www.access-board.gov/
http://216.218.205.189/sec508/brochure.htm

University of Memphis ADA-friendly Web Sites for Students: The Why and How

http://www.people.memphis.edu/~profweb/ADA/

This site provides practical suggestions and resources for faculty to help create accessible sites for all students.

Activity 7: Hardware & Software Tutorial

This tutorial is to make faculty creating online courses aware of possible limitations of student computer equipment and software. It is important that faculty understand that students may have slower modems, limited software suites or different operating systems on their computers that could create challenges to the online class. This tutorial will not make the faculty experts, it will merely give them insight and create an awareness of potential difficulties.

Faculty participants will be given an on screen template to fill in the blanks regarding this information (this is a basic cloze lecture for workshop participants.)

I. Hardware: the mechanical and electrical components of the computer (the CPU and monitor) as well as devices that physically attach and act as peripheral devices (scanners, external disk drives, printers, etc.)

There are two basic types of computers that students have:

Macintosh (aka Apple)

PC (IBM clones)

Both of these computers are good to use however they will have differences based on *Operating Systems*, speed, memory capacity.

There are three basic ways in which students will communicate with the online course:

Dial-up modem

Cable-modem

DSL

The dial-up modem will be slower and it will take students longer to download files and information. They may also lag during real-time chat during virtual classroom sessions.

The cable-modem and DSL will have similar speeds and be comparable to the Internet speeds available on Saddleback College campus.

What should you do if a student has a technical problem?

1. Is it only 1 student?—refer the student to the ITC for help regarding the difficulty.
2. Is it many students with a similar problem?—Contact the ITC yourself. Find out if there is some way that you can alleviate a common problem by using a different delivery method. The ITC is there to support your efforts.

All students will have the same peripherals.—FALSE

Students will most likely have:

CDROM

Floppy Disk (A Drive)

Speakers

Students may have (but it is not guaranteed):

Printer

Scanner

Digital Camera

Students often do not have:

Microphone

DVDROM

CD/Read/Write

Please ask the workshop leader if you are unsure of what these devices may be.

II. Software: applications that can be used to produce (Microsoft Office) or that can be used to view (Adobe Acrobat Reader) or listen to digital files. This is a very basic definition. Other examples of software include games, music files, electronic books, pictures, and graphics.

1. All students will have some software in common:

Word processing program (usually MSWord)

Adobe Acrobat Reader (for reading PDF)

Email program

a program that views jpg/gif (picture) files

a program that can listen to online sound

an Internet browser

There is no guarantee that they will have any other software program that you require. If students do not have the above program they can be found via the Internet. Some must be purchased and others are available for free download at a variety of sites.

www.downloads.com

is an excellent site to find free software or software for purchase.

Please be certain that if you are expecting students to create spread sheets or create presentations using PowerPoint that they know prior to taking the course. If students are expected to use audio and video this should also be included in course requirements.

Computer Terms Defined

The following terms are defined in a user-friendly fashion to act as a practical guide to aid faculty who are unfamiliar with computers and computer terms. These are not technical definitions, but rather common usage for computer users.

- **Browser**—*n.* A browser enables the user to navigate the internet/world wide web. Examples include Internet Explorer (the big blue e) and Netscape Navigator. There are others.
- **Button**—*n.* A button is usually what a user "clicks" on 1 time to go elsewhere on a website. Buttons come in many shapes and sizes. You will learn to recognize them.
- **Click**—*v.* Clicking refers to using the mouse to highlight or choose an item (i.e. button or high lighted URL) on the computer. Clicking is used in single and double modes. *See single-click and double-click.*
- **Close**—*v.* Closing is using the mouse to leave a file, window or website. This may be done in several ways including clicking the 'x' in the upper right-hand corner of the window or clicking on 'file' (upper left) and choosing 'close'. If the user chooses 'exit' the entire program will be closed. In general once a user has closed a window or site he/she must go back to the beginning to reopen the site or window.
- **Control Panel**—*n.* The control panel is part of the instructor's course site on Blackboard™ . The control panel allows the instructor to add items to courses and manage materials, students, and assessment.
- **Course Site**—*n.* This refers to the URL classroom site where the instructor's class is held. Saddleback College uses Blackboard™ so Saddleback College instructors' course sites will be at www.socccd.blackboard.com
- **CPU**—*n.* This is your physical computer (the box).
- **Digital Format**—*n.* Document (i.e. quiz, lecture) typed, scanned, etc. so that it can be read on a computer.
- **Domain**—*n.* A domain is a virtual space where a user "lives". This is located on a computer server that holds user folders, files, and services such as printing.
- **Double-click**—*v.* The user will double-click using the left button on the mouse two times pressing very quickly. Double-clicking opens windows on the computer. Sometimes buttons need to be double-clicked.
- **Download**—*v.* To add something, a file or program, to your computer from another computer.
- **Field**—*n.* A field refers to a clear area where the user can input information. The mouse or tab key (on the keyboard) is used to move to each different area.
- **Go 'back'**—*v.* When using a web browser the user can return to the previous 'page' or screen by using the 'back' button near the top left of the browser window.
- **Go 'forward'**—*v.* If the user has previously gone 'back' to a page he/she can then go 'forward' again by using the 'forward' button near the top left of the browser window.
- **Hard copy**—*n.* a printed version of a computer document.
- **Interactive**—*adj.* Describes a computer site that allows the user to participate in the web site (i.e. answering questions, choosing answers, etc.)
- **Load**—*v.* To add something from one computer to another *see download* and *upload*

- **Log Off**—*v*. When entering the Blackboard™ course site the user Logs onto the site. When finished the user should click the 'Log Off' button to be certain that he/she has completely shutdown his/her permissions to the site.
- **Log On**—*v*. To enter the Blackboard™ course site instructors log onto their own course site using a specified log on name and password. This ensures that only the instructor has permission to make changes and control the site. This is the same for your Saddleback College account.
- **Metadata**—n. This is, in lay-terms, an underlined or highlighted word that, when clicked upon will take the user to a further explanation.
- **Network**—*n*. This is a group of computers, printers, etc., which can use each other's resources.
- **Open**—*v*. Opening a file, window or a site means that the user is accessing it. To access a file, window, etc. the user will have to double-click or single-click depending on circumstances.
- **Path**—*n*. A path refers to where a file or website is found. It will usually include the server name, folder, and file name.
- **Permissions**—*n*. All users are given 'permissions' to create certain actions on the computer. The Instructor will have permission to control his/her course site and access necessary student files and downloads.
- **Scan**—*v*. To make a digital image of a document using a scanner. The scanner can make a graphic image (picture) or it can make an editable image (documents). Note: Scanned documents should be edited carefully as it is a picture and sometimes letters can become transposed.
- **Search Engine**—*n*. There are a variety of search engines that will allow the user to type in a keyword or words and find websites that contain those words. The search engine will often return a large number of websites not all of which will have useful information. It is up to the user to determine how accurate and useful the websites may be.
- **Single-click**—*v*. The user will single-click using the left button on the mouse one time. The user will usually single-click when a button is available or when the file is already highlighted.
- **Tab**—*v*. The user can use the tab button to navigate from field to field rather than using the mouse for this purpose.
- **Upload**—*v*. To put a document, etc. onto another computer, server, or web site from a computer, floppy disk, or CDROM.
- **URL**—*n*. URL refers to the path to a website.
- **User**—*n*. This is a person who uses the computer.
- **Website**—*n*. This is a page on the world wide web. Each website has its own URL or address. This is the path that leads the user's computer to the desired site.
- **Window**—*n*. This is part of the Microsoft system. By double-clicking on the file an opening is created that resembles a window on the desktop (hence the name 'window').

Where stuff goes

A quick guide to your virtual classroom

The control panel of Blackboard™ has a lot of buttons. This guide should help you find the section of the control panel that will allow you to input whatever you want to enhance your virtual classroom environment.

There can be overlap of content areas. Choose one location and stick to it. The course documents is a great place for you to explain to the students where they can find all pertinent materials. Remember that you want them to have the proper tools to succeed—this is not a game of hide-and-go-seek.

How can I do stuff to my course site? (Where do I make changes?)

Control Panel

This allows you to manage your site
This allows you to control the course
This makes you king/queen of your site

Where can I input students?

User Management

This allows your to input students
Modify the students
List students
Create student groups
Manage students groups

Where should I put general course information?

Content Areas

Course Information is the best place to put the course objectives, course description, course syllabus, as well as any individual course requirements that you have an instructor such as participation, papers, deadlines, etc.

Where can I add assignments?

Content Areas

There is a specific *assignments* section under this general category

The instructor can add single assignments (*add item*), assignment categories (*add folder*) with a series of similar assignment under it.

Examples of categories:

- readings
- essays
- worksheets

quizzes
answer keys

Where can I input quizzes and tests?

Assessment

Quizzes and tests can be input using the *assessment manager*. Choose either to add a *quiz/exam* or you can even add a *survey*.

You can add a variety of items using a variety of testing methods (i.e. multiple choice, multiple answer, true/false, short answer, essay, etc.)

When you have finished inputting the quiz/exam remember to *preview* it and add point values to each item.

The instructor can choose when the quiz is available to the students using the starting and ending dates. Be certain to let students know under which section (*Assignments*, *Course Documents*, *etc.*) that you will be adding the assessment Be certain to add the availability times to the course calendar.

Where can students leave assignments for me to grade?

Course Tools

The students and instructors have different ways to access the *digital drop-box*. The students will access it under the *communication* button while instructors will access it through the *control panel* and *course tools*.

Under *course tools* the instructor can access the *digital drop-box*. The students also have the ability to use the *digital drop box* to send assignments. BE CERTAIN TO REMIND STUDENTS that they must add a file AND send the file. Just putting the file into the drop box will not get it to the instructor.

How can I return assignments?

Course Tools

Under *course tools* the instructor can access the *digital drop-box*. You will choose the student to whom you want to return an assignment and add the document. You will have the option to add a message. Please note the reminders for students—the file must be both added and sent to go to the intended recipient.

Where can I add Web Site Links for Students?

Content Areas

Under the *content areas* instructors can add *external links*. External links can be to search engines that the students might use for research, to sites that have information for specific course topics, etc.

Where do I input information about myself and other faculty and staff members who are involved in teaching my course?

Content Areas

Under the *content areas* instructors, teaching assistants and guest lecturers, etc. can be added using the *staff information* link. This allows those running the course to give pertinent information such as email, telephone, office number, office hours, and other information that they regard as important to the students. *Staff Information* may also contain a brief biography or personal information that may make the instructor more accessible to the students.

Where can I input grades for my students?

Assessment

Under *Assessment* the instructor can access the *online gradebook*. The gradebook offers a variety of viewing choices. The instructor can view by student, by item, or by spreadsheet view (which is a standard gradebook view.) The instructor can also export the gradebook as a comma delineated file if he/she uses an outside grading program. The instructor should let the students know that grades can be accessed via the *tools* section of their student site.

Faculty Worksheet for Hardware Tutorial

I. Hardware: the mechanical and electrical components of the computer (the CPU and monitor) as well as devices that physically attach and act as peripheral devices (scanners, external disk drives, printers, etc.)

There are two basic types of computers that students have:

____

____

Both of these computers are good to use however they will have differences based on *Operating Systems*, speed, memory capacity.

There are three basic ways in which students will communicate with the online course:

____

____

____

The dial-up modem will be slower and it will take students longer to download files and information. They may also lag during real-time chat during virtual classroom sessions.

The cable-modem and DSL will have similar speeds and be comparable to the Internet speeds available on Saddleback College campus.

What should you do if a student has a technical problem?

1. Is it only 1 student?—refer the student to the ITC for help regarding the difficulty.
2. Is it many students with a similar problem?—Contact the ITC yourself. Find out if there is some way that you can alleviate a common problem by using a different delivery method. The ITC is there to support your efforts.

All students will have the same peripherals.—FALSE

Students will most likely have:

____

____

____

Students may have (but it is not guaranteed):

____

____

____

Students often do not have:

____

____

____

Please ask the workshop leader if you are unsure of what these devices may be.

II. Software: applications that can be used to produce (Microsoft Office) or that can be used to view (Adobe Acrobat Reader) or listen to digital files. This is a very basic definition. Other examples of software include games, music files, electronic books, pictures, and graphics.

1. All students will have some software in common:

____

____

____

____

____

____

There is no guarantee that they will have any other software program that you require. If students do not have the above program they can be found via the Internet. Some must be purchased and others are available for free download at a variety of sites.

www.downloads.com

is an excellent site to find free software or software for purchase.

Please be certain that if you are expecting students to create spread sheets or create presentations using PowerPoint that they know prior to taking the course. If students are expected to use audio and video this should also be included in course requirements.

Communication in Blackboard™ (BBII) Workshop

Objective:

To teach faculty how to navigate the more advanced communication features of Blackboard™. The communication features include email, discussion thread, virtual classroom, and chat. The faculty will learn how each of these features works and how to use each one effectively in the online course.

Materials Needed:

Computer
Internet Access
Note taking materials (if desired)
LCD projector

Workshop Leader:
Prior to the workshop:

Be certain that each faculty member has a course site with user name, password, and other workshop members assigned as students.
Set up groups within the faculty attending workshop for activities 2-5 (see #2 below much of this will be conjecture based on previous workshop experiences and knowledge of faculty—call and ask….)
Print out group lists and set up seating arrangement (post it prior to the workshop)
Set up LCD projector for Activity 1
Have one workshop mentor available to run each group.

Workshop Agenda:

1. Verify faculty who are at the workshop using Flex credit sign-in sheet
2. Stratification: faculty of a variety of skill levels should be grouped together so that those with more computer experience or who learn at a faster pace can work as examples for those with less experience.
3. Review and computer Blackboard™ basics as needed/desired by participants
4. Activity 1: using the LCD projector go through/review the control panel buttons that control the communications features: email, discussion thread, virtual classroom, and chat.
5. Get into groups led by workshop mentors.
6. Activity 2: Using Email (Blackboard™ Instructor's Manual, p. 83)
7. Activity 3: Using Discussion Thread (Blackboard™ Instructor's Manual, pp. 93-96)
8. Brief break as groups finish (5-10 minutes)
9. Activity 4: Using the Virtual Classroom and Chat Part I (in groups) (Blackboard™ Instructor's Manual, pp. 88-92)

10. Activity 5: Using the Virtual Classroom and Chat Part II (entire body) (Blackboard™ Instructor's Manual, pp. 88-92)
11. Activity 6: Receiving Homework Assignments (Blackboard™ Instructor's Manual, pp. 97-98)
12. Review the online Discussion Thread Mentoring area where faculty can leave questions.
13. Last 5 minutes: using LCD put up the sites of other Blackboard™ tutorials, mentor emails, etc. and review the discussion thread site where faculty can leave questions.
14. Have faculty fill-out workshop evaluation on the workshop course site

BBII Activities

Objective:

The objective of this workshop is to help faculty utilize the communication portions of the Blackboard™ program effectively.

Materials needed:

Computer
Internet Access
Course site for each participant (with other participants as students)
LCD projector

Activity 1: Reviewing the control panel buttons for online communication

Show the mentor site on the LCD projector
The workshop leader (WL) will open his/her computer to the main control panel
- Click on the button for email (have faculty do the same)
- WL will send an email to the workshop participants at this moment
- WL will click the button for the discussion thread.
- WL will show briefly how discussion is accessed, to answer a thread, to create a new thread and to finish a thread
- WL will click the button to open the virtual classroom
  - WL will demonstrate the buttons used to open/limit student access during an online session
  - WL will demonstrate adding a PowerPoint lecture to the class
  - WL will demonstrate adding a URL to the class

Since the objective to this activity is reviewing of where buttons are located (the locations were introduced in the BBI online tutorials section) this activity should be brief and faculty participants should be encouraged to wait with questions until the actual activity regarding each communication section is entered into.

Activity 2: Using Email

Email is an important tool for communication in the online course. You should be able to easily send email to one or all of the students in a course. You should also be able to receive email with ease as well. Checking email regularly will keep the lines of communication open and better serve the students. You should let the students know to expect a response to their emails within a set period of time (24 to 48 hours would be usual). Having designated a set time, let students know if you will need more time or will not be available for a period of time.

1. Begin on the main course page of Blackboard™ (navigation area)
2. Choose the *Communication* button
3. Choose *send email*

4. There are six choices to whom to send email. Select the link for *All Users*
5. Click *send email*
6. Type the subject of the email, "Email Practice 1" into the subject field
7. Type: "What course are you teaching online?" and "Please attach your syllabus." into the message field.
8. Click *send message*

Your email will be accessed and received through the Saddleback College Email program.

9. Log onto your Saddleback College Email.
10. Check your email for new messages.
11. Reply appropriately to the email requests that you have received from other workshop participants (including attaching the syllabus).
12. Ask the mentor if you are having difficulty with email.

Activity 3: Using the Discussion Thread

The discussion thread can be used for a variety of activities in your online class. Setting up areas for students to ask and answer each other's questions can be helpful. Students may also be required to comment on required readings in the discussion format, etc.

1. On your course site choose *Discussion Board* from the main navigation panel
2. Click on the *Forum* button
3. Add the title, "Blackboard™ Online Course Questions"
4. Describe the Forum as, "Instructors questions regarding use of Blackboard™ program."
5. Allow *anonymous posts*, *file attachments*, *new threads* by checking the box next to those options.
6. Click *add forum*
7. Access the forum that appears on the page by clicking on the link
8. Click on *start new thread*
9. Title the new thread, "Can you help me?"
10. Add the description, "Write one question that you have about using the Blackboard™ program. Then choose one question submitted by another workshop member to answer OR to add to his/her question."
11. Click *submit*
12. Go back to your home page on Blackboard™ and choose one of the courses in which you are listed as a student
13. Click on the *Discussion Board* button
14. Click on the posted *Forum*
15. Click on the posted *thread*
16. Click on the *Can you help me* thread.
17. Click the *reply* button
18. Type a question or concern that you have about teaching online into the message field.
19. Click *preview* (this will allow you to view your message
20. Click *submit* to post the message.

21. Go back to your home page and choose another course in which your are enrolled as a student and repeat the process above making comments or suggestions in reply to others questions.

As the instructor you may select, unselect, Invert selection of, Mark as read, mark as unread, lock, unlock, and/or collect discussion threads. You may also remove threads as well as archive them for use later in the course.

22. In your online course (in which you are instructor) return to the discussion board
23. Click on the posted forum *Instructors' questions regarding use of Blackboard™ Program*
24. If the threads are not expanded click *Expand All*
25. Click on *show options*
26. Click to *Select All*
27. Click to *Collect* (this will display the results all on one page).
28. Review the questions and the answers and comments listed.
29. Discuss with the mentor within small groups.

Activity 4: Using the Virtual Classroom (Part I)

In this exercise each mentor will act as instructor for workshop participants and lead a virtual classroom lecture/discussion. There will be no talking during this portion of the workshop except to describe buttons and functions initially and address technical issues.

1. Through a preset online course participants should enter the virtual classroom button from the main page of the designated course
2. The mentor will link the 'classroom' to the virtual classroom portion of the Blackboard™ instructor's manual
3. The mentor will review the parts of the virtual classroom pointing to each button and explaining its use.
4. The mentor will demonstrate uploading a PowerPoint presentation and adding a link for users to follow (the link will be to the Blackboard™ site where the instructor's manual can be downloaded).
5. *The mentor will announce that the online session will begin and instruct participants to follow the directions on the computer screen as if they were students. Initially the mentor should allow all students to answer and then as they become more comfortable use options to limit.*
6. The mentor will instruct the participants: I am going to ask you some simple questions regarding Blackboard™ . Answer using the virtual Blackboard™ buttons that I have shown you. Ask the participants a question regarding Blackboard™ (i.e. "Where can a student find information regarding your course syllabus on your Blackboard™ course site?")
7. Do 4-6 more simple questions in the same manner
8. Mentor will now require the participants to each ask a question, one at a time, and have the other students answer.
9. Show how to save and archive the virtual class.

Activity 5: Using the Virtual Classroom (Part II)

This activity will be the same as the above *except* that each participant will take a turn as the course instructor. Using the mentor's workstation, each participant will control the classroom, upload a link, and upload a PowerPoint with the one-to-one aid of the mentor.

Each participant will lead a brief discussion about one aspect of Blackboard™ or of another subject that he/she is familiar with. The mentor should be prepared with extra topics, and web sites, although the same PowerPoint may be used each time.

Activity 6: Receiving Homework Assignments

This activity will show faculty where the digital drop box for homework is located and what students need to do to submit homework to it. Then the workshop participants will use the drop box to pick-up assignments and to return assignments

1. Log onto a given course site as a student (same as used earlier to practice *discussion thread*
2. Go to the *Tools* area of the course site
3. Click on *Digital Drop Box*
4. Upload your own course syllabus to the course instructor with a note.

As the instructor you will not ever enter the drop box by this method, however, you may need to let students know the procedure if they are not using the drop box properly. Communication is key for the students to be successful.

5. Log onto your teaching course site.
6. Go to the *Control Panel*
7. Under *Course Tools* click on *Digital Drop Box*
8. Choose any document to click and open
9. Save it to your own disk or folder using the *save as* command under file
10. Click on *send file*
11. Using the drop down menu choose the name of the "student" to whom you are returning the document
12. Title the file "Returned Syllabus"
13. Click on *browse* and add the link to the syllabus that you opened and saved
14. Add a comment to the *comment* section available (i.e. "very innovative" or "yes, I received the document")
15. Click *submit*

Using the Computer to Advantage (BBIII) Workshop

Objective:

To learn how computer technology can be used to effectively meet the needs of a diverse student body who have a variety of learning styles. The Learning Styles Tutorial (LST) will be used to introduce ideas and/or refresh knowledge of common student and instructor learning styles and how these different styles can be easily accommodated in the online classroom.

Materials Needed:

Computer
Internet Access
Note taking materials (if desired)
LCD projector
Materials created from HDI online tutorial (hard copy or server access—hard copy may be best for the purposes of the workshop)

Workshop Leader:
Prior to the workshop:

Workshop Course site should be loaded with links to readings (Saddleback College Library) and
the Learning Styles Tutorial Quiz
Stratification: faculty with similar fields (i.e. science with science) should be grouped together for the beginning of the workshop
Stratification 2: create faculty groups with field variety for Activity XXX
Print out group lists and set up seating arrangement
Set up LCD projector for Activity XX
Have one workshop mentor available to run each group

Workshop Agenda:

1. Verify faculty who are at the workshop
2. Stratification: faculty of similar fields should be seated together.
3. Review any computer or Blackboard™ basics as needed or desired by participants
4. Activity 1: Online Learning Styles Tutorial (working individually)
5. Activity 2: Online activities and assignments (in major group)
6. Brief break as groups finish (5-10 minutes)
7. Activity 3: Virtual Classroom: meeting the needs of all learners
8. Last 5 minutes: using LCD put up the sites of other Blackboard™ tutorials, mentor emails, etc. and review the discussion thread site where faculty can leave questions.
9. Have faculty fill-out workshop evaluation on the workshop course site

BBIII Activities

Materials needed:

- Computer
- Internet Access
- Course site for each participant (with other participants as students)
- LCD projector

Activity 1: Learning Styles Tutorial

Objective: The objective of this tutorial is to refresh instructors' knowledge of student learning styles so as to enhance instructors ability to create an online course that will effectively instruct all learners.

Readings:

Definition of Learning Styles Summary (Schar, 2001) *Word Document*

Davies, M., & Wovering, M. (1999, Fall). Alternative Assessment: New Directions in Teaching and Learning. Contemporary Education, 71 (1), 39-45.

Dooley, K., Edmundson, C., & Hobaugh, C. (1997). Instructional design: A critical ingredient in the distance education soup. (Report). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 415 935)

Ebeling, D.G. (2001, March). Teaching to ALL Learning Styles. The Education Digest, 66 (7), 41-5.

Follows, S.B. (1999, November). Virtual Learning Environments. T.H.E. Journal, 27 (4), 100+.

Grasha, A.F., & Yangarber-Hicks, N. (2000, Winter). Integrating Teaching Styles and Learning Styles With Instructional Technology. College Teaching, 48 (1), 2-10.

Hillesheim, G. (1998). The search for quality standards in distance learning. Report in Distance Learning '98. Proceedings of the Annual Conference on Distance Teaching & Learning, 14th, Madison, WI. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 422 856)

Naidu, S. (1997). Collaborative reflective practice: An institutional design architecture for the internet. Distance Education, 18, 257-283.

Ross, J. L., & Schultz, R. A. (1999, Fall). Using the World Wide Web to Accommodate Diverse Learning Styles. College Teaching, 47 (4), 123-9.

Sub-Activity A: What do you do in the classroom?

1. Create a list of activities that you currently use in your traditional class (i.e. lecture, research paper, group activity, worksheets, reading)
2. Based on the Learning Styles Defined note which learning styles each activity support.
3. Add new activities that you would like to add to your course that would a) expand the types of learners who would feel comfortable in the class and b) use online computer resources to enhance your current activities.
4. Create a list of the activities that you believe are not compatible with an online course environment. Keep this list it will be used in the future.

Sub-Activity B: Quiz

1. Learning styles for online classes area different for learning styles in the traditional classroom.
   True
   False

2. Educational literature has one definitive set of definitions regarding student learning styles.
   True
   False

3. Teaching styles and learning styles are related.
   True
   False

4. Learning styles include (choose all that apply)
   a. auditory
   b. visual
   c. tactile
   d. learner-centered

5. Group work can enhance learning in the classroom
   True
   False

6. What are three alternatives to lecture for online courses?

7. How can students participate in group activities in an online course?

8. How can an instructor assist auditory learners attending online courses?

9. How can an instructor assist visual learners who are attending online courses?

10. How can an instructor assist tactile learners who are attending online courses?

11. Learners have only one learning style
    True
    False
12. Instructors have only one teaching style
    True
    False
13. Students can learn via a variety of styles with support and thoughtful assignments.
    True
    False

Sub-Activity C

1. Create a discussion thread: ask a question regarding learning styles and in-class activities specific to your classroom (i.e. *I use a lot of lecture, how can I lecture in an online course OR what can I use to replace it?*)

Activity 2: Online Activities and Assignments

The participants will be working in small groups each led by a mentor. Each group will be comprised of faculty with similar content areas (as much as possible). Some of this tutorial will not use the computer, but rather will be group discussion and brainstorming. It will finish with each group working to answer discussion thread questions proposed in the 1st activity.

1. Participants will each briefly discuss the types of activities that they use in the traditional classroom and which activities that they believe will easily translate to an online format. This discussion will be led and facilitated by the mentor group leader.
2. After each participant has briefly discussed his/her activities others may comment on possible difficulties that might arise or other possibilities for reaching the objective that would better in the online environment. It is essential that the mentor take an active role in this step pointing out potential trouble spots AND how they can be avoided. It is also essential that the mentor note good choices and what will most likely work well.
3. Participants will now each briefly discuss their list of activities that they believe will not translate to the online environment and why they believe it will not work.
4. After each participant has briefly discussed his/her activities others may comment on alternative activities or ways to actually perform the activity in the context of the online course. Again, the mentor is essential to this process as an expert. The mentor should encourage the fellow participants to solve the dilemmas and add his/her comments after all of these are finished commenting also on the group's suggestions.
5. The group should finish by opening the discussion thread on the BB course site where they had previously input questions. As a group, they should answer 2-3 of the questions, not necessarily from their own group.

Activity 3: Virtual Classroom

The participants will all be at their computers and logged on to the BB course for this workshop. The virtual classroom will be open and the WL will set the classroom discussion for recognizing 1 student at a time and only with the instructor's permission. The LCD projector will be on and the instructor will attach the discussion thread.

1. All workshop participants will go through the discussion thread questions from activity1and the answers that the small groups had given.
2. When a participant has a comment or further question he/she will use the virtual classroom board to ask his/her question or make a comment. (The WL should encourage no talking during this time—the focus is to review the ideas and maintain a virtual environment for practice.)

Definitions of Learning Styles Summary

There are a number of learning styles described in educational literature. The definitions below are a sampling of types of learning styles described which might help instructors assess their teaching styles with regard to online courses. The source is the article listed preceding the information.

Ross, J. L., & Schultz, R. A. (1999, Fall). Using the World Wide Web to Accommodate Diverse Learning Styles. College Teaching, 47 (4), 123-9.

Visual

Learn through visual images. These learners prefer written instruction.

Suggested stimuli:

- Streaming video
- Graphics
- Notes on PowerPoint presentation
- Pre-reading
- Written directions
- Discussion thread
- Chat

Auditory

Learn through hearing. These learners prefer verbal instruction.

Suggested stimuli:

- Auditory stimuli—sound clips
- Include appropriate sound clips in PowerPoint lectures
- Verbal reinforcement—telephone/office hours
- Pre-reading

Tactile/Kinesthetic

Learn through doing. These learners learn best in hands-on situations

Suggested stimuli:

- Provide activities
- Encourage participation
- Assignments involving pictures & models
- Discussion thread
- Draw images & charts
- chat
- look up something
- try out something

Social/Collaborative

Processes information within groups and social interaction
Enjoys interactive tasks and group work and collaboration
Interactive discussion, debate, sharing ideas or stories

Concrete sequential

Linear sequential thinker who processes through concrete tangible senses
Enjoys tasks with cause and effect relationships, lab exercises, task analysis,
Flow charts, developing arguments, writing or following directions
Generating examples or analysis of key ideas

Concrete random

Random multidimensional thinker processes information best when tanglible and
Grasped by senses
Tasks with exploration, problem solving, hypothesis generating, independent thinking
Synthesizing, idea generating, anticipating problems (what if…)

Abstract sequential

Uses intuition and reason to process information that may be invisible to the senses
Linear and sequential thinking
Tasks involving interpreting textual material, vocab building, integration of disparate
information, logical analysis, conceptual model building, debate

Abstract random

Random, multidimensional thinker processes information when invisible to senses and
Involves reason and intuition
Tasks involving global evaluation, interpersonal interaction, affective analysis, multi-
Dimensional analysis, creative, imaginative tasks, mind mapping.

Grasha, A.F., & Yangarber-Hicks, N. (2000, Winter). Integrating Teaching Styles and Learning Styles With Instructional Technology. College Teaching, 48 (1), 2-10.

Instructor-centered (high, intermediate, moderate):

The instructor here is the center of the classroom. The instructor gives instruction and information. The student follows directions—is less independent.

Learner-centered (high, intermediate, moderate):

The learner here is the center of the classroom. The instructor may model and support but the student takes an active role in moving the course forward. The student is independent.

Teaching Styles	Learning Styles
Expert	Dependent
Formal Authority	Participant
Personal Model	Competitive
Facilitator	Collaborative
Delegator	Independent

Blackboard™ Review Workshop

Objective:

To review the Blackboard™ program and online course instruction with regard to faculty who have asked for further instruction or support.

Materials Needed:

Computer
Internet Access
Note taking materials (if desired)
LCD projector
Questions from faculty participants

Workshop Leader:
Prior to the workshop:

Stratification will depend on the size and the needs of the group
Print out group lists and set up seating arrangement
Set up LCD projector
Have one workshop mentor available
Review the discussion thread area for repetitive/common questions
Have faculty submit specific questions about Blackboard™ and online instruction
Write agenda based on discussion thread and specific questions

  a. common questions to the group regarding Blackboard™ program beginning with set up basics, followed by grades, and finally communication
  b. common questions regarding activities, assignments, and working the virtual classroom
  c. very specific or unusual questions regarding Blackboard™ or online teaching

Workshop Agenda: time 1-2 hours

1. Verify faculty who are attending workshop
2. Set up stratification groups if appropriate
3. Using LCD projector: review set up basics: inputting students, assignments, course information focusing on participants questions/needs
4. Using LCD projector: review inputting grades, picking up assignments and grading focusing on participants questions/needs
5. Using LCD projector: review using email, discussion thread focusing on participants questions/needs
6. Short break if needed
7. Using LCD projector: review the virtual classroom (entire group) focusing on participants questions/needs

8. Using LCD projector: review learning styles and activities that could be used based on the area of specialization of faculty participants (group work) focusing on participants questions/needs
9. Have faculty fill-out workshop evaluation on the workshop course site

Steps 3 through the end will all be optional. The workshop leader will determine prior to the workshop which areas need to be reviewed based on the faculty needs as presented through question submission on the thread discussion and specific questions submitted to the leader from participants.

Appendix H

Letter To Dr. Donald Busché Submitting Program to Saddleback College

Dr. Donald Busché
Saddleback College
28000 Marguerite Pkwy.,
Mission Viejo, CA 92692

April 29, 2002

Dear Dr. Busché:

Enclosed you will find a copy of the Saddleback College Blackboard™ and Online Course Program that was designed through my applied dissertation study with Nova Southeastern University. The program contains three parts incorporated into it: the faculty professional development program, the implementation of the program, and program assessment. The program contains a series of workshops, online tutorials, discussion thread exercises, and a mentor program that work together to create information and support for Saddleback College faculty who are creating online courses. This is the plan for supporting the faculty via professional development training.

You will also find a sheet with a list of recommendations for implementation, evaluation, and further research regarding this program. While it is the intent of this program to fulfill the needs of Saddleback College regarding the training of faculty for using Blackboard™ to create online courses, the program is designed to be flexible and grow with the experience of the faculty.

Thank you for the opportunity to work with Saddleback College. I am also grateful for the support of the members of your faculty and staff who worked on my formative committee. They were excellent resources and contributed greatly to this project.

Sincerely

Anne Marie Schar
190 E. O'Keefe St. #13
Menlo Park, CA 94025
(650) 321-4814
schars@sbcglobal.net

encl.

Recommendations

It is recommended that this program be implemented by the Saddleback College ITC. The program should be implemented as developed by the study. The program was developed based on successful model programs, change theory, and professional development literature review. Each component was included to support the others to create a successful and flexible program to meet the needs of the Saddleback College faculty who are creating online courses.

It is also recommended that faculty mentors be compensated for their extra time. Successful mentoring programs in the literature review recommend that mentors be compensated in some way. The program that dropped its mentoring component noted that it was due to lack of time and inclination on the part of faculty members who were not compensated for the extra work. The mentoring could be added into the faculty workload as fulfillment of flex hours or the equivalent of teaching one course. Faculty would be responsible for fulfilling commensurate time to equal the above. Another option is that a stipend could be offered to the faculty member to compensate for time spent mentoring other faculty. A third option is that the faculty member could receive professional advancement credit. This implies that there is accountability on the part of the faculty member through reporting hours and participation to the Blackboard™ program coordinator.

In the development of any program it is important that program evaluation be implemented. However, it is the recommendation of this study that evaluation be implemented and on-going throughout the entire program. In order to know that the program is fulfilling the needs of the faculty, it is essential that the program evaluations be completed at the end of each workshop and that the Blackboard™ program coordinator review these at the completion of each workshop.

The evaluations of each workshop should reviewed by the Blackboard™ program coordinator. It is recommended that one person be specifically assigned this task so that the ongoing assessment is actually completed. Model programs noted that while evaluations were being filled out at the conclusion of workshop, they were not read or analyzed. If there are needs that are not being met, the program should be adjusted accordingly.

The Blackboard™ Discussion Thread and the mentor program will provide informal program feedback and evaluation. It is the responsibility of mentors to monitor the BDT as well as provide support to faculty beyond the online tutorials and workshops. Common needs for training and information should be communicated to the Blackboard™ program coordinator and possible program adjustments should ensue.

Faculty who desire to participate in the Blackboard™ program may not have appropriate computer skills for creating and maintaining an effective online course. It is recommended that the Saddleback College administration establish minimum computer competency guidelines for faculty wishing to participate in creating online courses and in the Blackboard™ workshops.

It is also recommended that further research be done to support the Blackboard™ program. It is recommended that the Blackboard™ program coordinator or someone he assigns be in contact with other institutions working to create or who have already created similar programs.

California community college program directors asked many questions during the interview regarding other institutions and stated that they might work to implement ideas gathered from other institutions interviewed. This indicates that the sharing of ideas for this type of program can be helpful and lead to the development of more effective programming.

Finally, it is recommended that the program coordinator and mentors work to keep current with technological and pedagogical issues related to teaching courses online. This can be done via the main Internet Blackboard™ site which has development tools, chat rooms, and training information. It is recommended that the Blackboard™ program coordinator meet with the faculty and staff mentors at least one time per semester to disseminate the information gathered through the research as well as to discuss any considered program changes.

Biographical Sketch of Anne Marie Schar

Anne Marie Schar (neé Renaud) was born and raised in Michigan. She was one of 5 children and attended local public schools and graduated from high school in 1983. Subsequently, Schar attended Michigan State University for 2 years, including the Summer Program in Mayen, Germany. In 1985 she transferred to West Virginia University to study in the International Studies Program.

Schar earned a Bachelor of Arts degree in International Studies and German (1987) from West Virginia University in Morgantown, West Virginia. She also earned her Master of Arts degree in Foreign Language Teaching (1990) from West Virginia University. Schar taught English as a Second Language and German Language Courses while working toward her Master of Arts degree.

Schar continued to live in West Virginia and took a full-time faculty position at Salem-Teikyo University (1990), Salem, WV. She taught ESL and German Language Courses. She taught the S-TU summer language program in Berlin at Teikyo, Berlin. As part of her faculty position she participated in campus committees, curriculum development, accreditation studies, and was moderator of the S-TU rugby team. She remained at S-TU until February 1997.

In 1997 Schar moved to Los Angeles to get married. She was happy to change jobs 4 times in the next 5 years. Her first west-coast position was that of tele-banker, quickly followed by legal conflicts-checker with a national law firm. Finally, she settled in as a corporate trainer for over a year, designing and providing sales training for the work force selling home electronics. She traveled extensively through the United States and Canada. This illustrious corporate career ended when Schar choose to return to teaching in August 1998. She taught Sophomore English and Freshman World History at Bishop Montgomery High School (BMHS). In 2000, BMHS offered her a chance to be the Technology Director and to chair the Computer

Science Department. With this position came the responsibility of training faculty and staff as well as curriculum development. The position offered her a chance to learn new technical skills as well as helping to incorporate technology into the everyday curriculum of the institution.

In the fall of 2001, Schar and her husband again relocated to Silicon Valley. Currently, Schar is working as Technology Director at Mid-Peninsula High School. She combines technical work with teacher training and curriculum development.

HE035729

U.S. Department of Education

Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Development of a Program to Support Faculty in the Creation of Online Courses at Saddleback College

Author(s): Anne Marie Schar

Corporate Source:

Publication Date: August 2002

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☒

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, please

Signature: Anne Marie Schar

Printed Name/Position/Title: Anne Marie Schar

Organization/Address: 1340 Willow Rd Menlo Park, CA 94025

Telephone: 650 321 1991

FAX:

E-Mail Address: amschar@yahoo.com

Date: 3/5/2003

(Over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfacility.org